

necessary to solve its problems, many individuals lack the needed skills, training, education, or mobility to get and keep jobs in the face of labor displacements necessitated by technological changes. The Commission recommends many important programs to help these individuals to enter and reenter the labor force to upgrade their skills through education and training.

The Commission also recommends a program of public service employment which would provide many hard-core unemployed with rewarding work opportunities, while at the same time providing society with some of the human resources needed to meet our unmet individual and community needs. This proposal deserves strong and immediate consideration by Congress both in the light of the emerging labor shortages in some areas and occupations, and in light of the continuing high unemployment among teenagers and Negroes.

The Commission's proposals for 14 years of free education, for improvement of the employment service, and for better matching our technological capabilities and human needs also deserve serious consideration.

The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be holding hearings shortly on this report.

I should like to offer my thanks to the members of the Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress for their dedicated and successful efforts to acquaint our Nation with what needs to be done to make technological advancement a national asset instead of a national liability.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I shall be doing my best to incorporate into legislative form those recommendations of the Commission which require legislation.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the order entered on Thursday, February 3, 1966, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, in accordance with the order entered on Thursday, February 3, 1966, until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend T. J. Mattingly, pastor, First Christian Church, Knoxville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, every day is the most important day in our turbulent lives. Look with Thy special favor upon these legislators who have been entrusted by their people to properly enact laws and serve the cause of freedom. Our Father, may

the somber overtones of the sounding guns of war make us more conscious than ever of our responsibility to our servicemen who will die today.

Make us patriotic in the real meaning of patriotism. Recall us again to be our best selves. The day of our years are short—too short for compromise.

Give then, Thy wisdom without which we have no wisdom.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week the House voted on rollcalls No. 6 and No. 7. Because of illness I was unavoidably absent. Though my vote was not needed, I want the permanent RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have supported the Un-American Activities Committee with "aye" votes on these two rollcalls and on the other five contempt citations that were passed by voice vote.

TRIBUTE TO BUSINESSMAN EDWARD MARCUS FOR HIS WORK IN THE TEXAS PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, as our various governmental and business entities are seeking to establish more and better relations and trade with our Latin American neighbors, it is most heartening to note that one of your good friends and constituents is putting into practice those principles of which so many talk but do nothing.

That his efforts are bringing goodwill to the United States is attested to by the news release quoted herewith:

LIMA, PERU, February 2, 1966.—Dallas businessman Edward Marcus was awarded the Order of the Sun of Peru Wednesday night for his work in the Texas Partners of the Alliance.

The award, Peru's highest honor, was established by Jose San Martin, 19th century liberator.

Marcus accepted the award at a dinner with President Fernando Belaunde Terry. Marcus is chairman of the Texas Alliance for Progress. It works with Peru in the exchange of educational and technical assistance.

The Texas business leader arrived in Lima Tuesday, accompanied by his wife. He told a reporter he also was exploring business possibilities in Peru. "I want to be in touch

with prospects. It is good for our countries and investors." He said he plans to return to Dallas next Wednesday.

I join with many others in commending the outstanding efforts of Mr. Marcus.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 7, I was unavoidably detained in my district. I missed rollcall No. 11 on the bill (H.R. 12410) to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, as amended.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I wish the RECORD would so indicate.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my objection to the Bureau of the Budget's action in reducing the special school milk program for America's boys and girls for 1967 from \$103 million to \$21 million.

If schools desire to now continue the program, they must replace Federal funds by moneys obtained from local tax sources. Thus, we merely transfer the cost rather than reduce it.

The school milk program has been one of the most successful projects initiated to benefit our country's boys and girls in schools and in special centers for underprivileged youngsters. Therefore, many voices are being heard in opposition to this cut. Some of these views are being expressed by my colleagues in Congress from all over the United States. Other expressions of this nature have been voiced by other reputable observers such as the Washington Post, top school officials in the Nation, and others who are interested in the diets of America's schoolchildren.

The Washington Post, in supporting school lunch and school milk programs, summarized by saying:

The milk and the lunches served a better purpose all these years than merely keeping up farm prices. They were good for children and the children continue to need them * * *. This country can afford to encourage nourishing diets for its schoolchildren even in a year when dairy prices no longer require that support.

As indicated, many others do not believe that this is a program where budget cuts should be made. In order that these viewpoints, as well as the administration's, can be given proper analysis, the gentleman from Minnesota, ALEC OLSON, my colleague on the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, and I have asked our chairman, the gentleman from California, HARLAN HAGEN, to call public hearings on these subjects.

I am satisfied such hearings, if they are held, will show the need and desirability for such programs' continuation.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my initial reaction to the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation calling for a reduction of more than 80 percent in the funds for the special milk program for the fiscal year 1966-67 was one of concern. And a thorough review of the recommendations has added greatly to that concern.

The recommended reduction of \$82 million is made possible by providing milk only to those defined as needy. This obviously creates the necessity of a means test.

I can express my views concerning the special milk program very simply. Milk is good for children, and there is no better way in which we can promote the consumption of this healthy commodity than to make it available to as many children as possible. Therefore, I feel we should be discussing expansion of the school milk program in keeping with expanded school enrollment rather than making a proposal that will make drastic reductions in the program.

No one wants to see a reduction in the use of milk in our school programs. But, if the consumption of milk by schoolchildren is to be maintained at the present level it is obvious that the cost of the program will only be transferred. Either the cost will be borne by the parents of the schoolchildren or by the already strained budgets of local school boards.

I believe this recommendation is an error and that the Congress will recognize the Bureau of the Budget's action for what it is—simply an attempt to save money in the wrong place.

There are even better arguments today for maintaining this program than when the legislation was first passed. The necessity of good nutrition among our school-age population is undisputed. It would be a bad bargain to sacrifice the benefits of the school milk program and the school lunch program in exchange for a threatened buildup of surplus and a resulting increase in Federal cost.

APPALACHIAN TRAIL

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, the famous footpath which extends from Maine to Georgia, a distance of some 2,000 miles.

I am most happy to sponsor this legislation, for in a time when primitive

recreational facilities are rapidly disappearing, I feel every effort should be made to protect and preserve scenic areas for the enjoyment of present and future generations.

Part of the trail does pass through the 19th District of Pennsylvania, which I represent, and while I have not had the occasion to hike over much of the trail, I did, many times during summers, enjoy hiking in the vicinity of Mount Katahdin in Maine where the trail begins and other parts of New England.

The bill which I have introduced will provide Federal recognition of the trail; coordinate and promote cooperation among Federal, State, and local interests in preserving, protecting, and improving the trail throughout its length. It will establish an Appalachian Trail Advisory Council with which the Secretary of the Interior will consult on any matter relating to the trail. The Secretary of the Interior will be authorized, with the consent and advice of interested Federal agencies, the Advisory Council, the States, and local parties, to define, redefine, and change the route of the trail in order to retain wherever possible the natural or scenic character of the trail and adjoining lands. Authorization will be given to acquire land, from willing sellers in the case of private property, to carry out the purposes of this bill.

STATE LOTTERY FOR NEW YORK

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to announce that my State, the great Empire State of New York, has finally passed a State lottery proposal which will go to the people for a referendum vote this November.

I wish to extend my congratulations to the members of the New York State Legislature for their wisdom and courage in recognizing and accepting the fact that the lottery idea is not only the best but the only painless and voluntary substitute for taxes.

The action taken by the New York State Legislature in approving the lottery method for raising additional revenue spells out not only a strong expression of resistance to the demand for tax increases, but an unequivocal approval and understanding of the urgency to tie together the need for additional income with the people's natural human urge to gamble.

Again, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to the New York State Legislature for its courage and its wisdom in tapping a very lucrative source of revenue to meet the ever-increasing educational needs of the State.

FILING OF REPORT ON THE BILL, S. 1666

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER- PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1966.
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Room H-206, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am deeply appreciative of your action in appointing me to membership on the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, and I had anticipated the pleasure of joining with my colleagues in a very fruitful discussion of matters of mutual interest to the legislators of both countries. I have been informed this morning, however, that the Appropriations Subcommittee on which I serve will be meeting throughout this week and will be considering the budget request for the Department of Justice.

Under the circumstances I feel that my first responsibility must be to attend these hearings and I am most regretful that I cannot therefore serve on the interparliamentary group. I hope you will give me another opportunity at a later date, at which time perhaps my committee responsibility will not interfere.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. SLACK, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSE OF STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 89

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 709, to provide additional funds for the expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 89, Report No. 1268, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 709

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 89, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional \$75,000 including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 133

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 716, to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133, report No. 1269, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 716

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 133, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, not to exceed \$150,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 133

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 717, to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by

House Resolution 133, Report No. 1270, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 717

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 133, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, not to exceed \$130,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee or subcommittee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the terms and availability of conventional mortgage financing, (3) the flow of savings in relation to home financing needs, (4) the operation of the various Government-assisted housing programs, (5) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, (6) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, including mass transportation and other related facilities, (8) urban and suburban problems, including transportation facilities, as they affect the availability of adequate housing, (9) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (10) rural housing and the adequacy of rural housing credit, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 35, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 697 to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 35, Report No. 1271, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 697

Resolved, That the further expenses of investigations and studies to be made pursuant to H. Res. 35 by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed

\$345,000, including expenditures for the employment of professional, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR EXPENSES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 245, COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 696, to provide for additional expenses for the investigations and studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service authorized by House Resolution 245, 89th Congress, Report No. 1272, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 696

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1966, the further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized pursuant to H. Res. 245 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$240,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR EXPENSES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 141, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report on

House Resolution 711, to provide funds for the further expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 141, Report No. 1273, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 711

Resolved, That the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 141 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$342,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR EXPENSES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 112, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 713, to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 112, Report No. 1274, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 713

Resolved, That the further expenses for the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 112, incurred by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or as a duly authorized subcommittee, not to exceed \$250,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, experts, and consultants (including personnel of the Library of Congress performing services on reimbursable detail) and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chair-

man of the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 68

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 718 providing additional funds for further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 68, 89th Congress, Report No. 1275, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 718

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 68 of the Eighty-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$60,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO EMPLOY EIGHT ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report on House Resolution 640 authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ eight additional employees—Report No. 1276—and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 640

Resolved, That, effective February 1, 1966, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ eight additional employees, five professional and three clerical, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO THE U.S. DELEGATION OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States interparliamentary group, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the special order granted on Monday, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12563) to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Andrews,	Fuqua	O'Hara, Mich.
N. Dak.	Gibbons	Passman
Baldwin	Goodell	Pelly
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Pool
Battin	Griffin	Powell
Berry	Gubser	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Roush
Broomfield	King, Calif.	Scott
Cahill	Leggett	Senner
Callaway	Martin, Mass.	Sisk
Celler	Martin, Nebr.	Springer
Dawson	Matsunaga	Thomas
Dowdy	Matthews	Toll
Ellsworth	Mink	Ullman
Ford,	Morton	Willis
Gerald R.	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12563

A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Asian Development Bank Act".

ACCEPTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Asian Development Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "Bank") provided for by the agreement establishing the Bank (here-

inafter referred to as the "agreement") deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

Sec. 3. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Governor of the Bank, an alternate for the Governor, and a Director of the Bank.

(b) No person shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor or Alternate Governor. The Director may, in the discretion of the President, receive such compensation, allowances, and other benefits as, together with those received by him from the Bank, will equal those authorized for a Chief of Mission, class 2, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Sec. 4. (a) The policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Bank shall be coordinated with other United States policies in such manner as the President shall direct.

(b) An annual report with respect to United States participation in the Bank shall be submitted to the Congress by such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

Sec. 5. Unless the Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, (a) subscribe to additional shares of stock of the Bank; (b) vote for or agree to any amendment of the agreement which increases the obligations of the United States, or which would change the purpose or functions of the Bank; or (c) make a loan or provide other financing to the Bank, except that funds for technical assistance not to exceed \$1,000,000 in any one year may be provided to the Bank by a United States agency created pursuant to an Act of Congress which is authorized by law to provide funds to international organizations.

DEPOSITORIES

Sec. 6. Any Federal Reserve bank which is requested to do so by the Bank shall act as its depository or as its fiscal agent, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall supervise and direct the carrying out of these functions by the Federal Reserve banks.

PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

Sec. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the purchase of twenty thousand shares of capital stock of the Bank, \$200,000,000.

(b) Any payment made to the United States by the Bank as a distribution of net income shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF ACTIONS

Sec. 8. For the purpose of any civil action which may be brought within the United States, its territories or possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by or against the Bank in accordance with the agreement, the Bank shall be deemed to be an inhabitant of the Federal judicial district in which its principal office or agency in the United States is located, and any such action to which the Bank shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States, including the courts enumerated in title 28, section 460, United States Code, shall have original jurisdiction of any such action. When the Bank is a defendant in any action in a State court, it may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such action into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

STATUS, IMMUNITIES, AND PRIVILEGES

Sec. 9. The agreement and particularly articles 49 through 56, shall have full force and effect in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico, upon acceptance of membership by the United States in, and the establishment of, the Bank. The President, at the time of deposit of the instrument of acceptance of membership by the United States in the Bank, shall also deposit a declaration that the United States retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its citizens or nationals.

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS INVESTMENT SECURITIES FOR NATIONAL BANKS

Sec. 10. The last sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by striking the word "or" after the words "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting after the words "the Inter-American Development Bank" the words "or the Asian Development Bank".

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS EXEMPT SECURITIES; REPORT FILED WITH SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sec. 11. (a) Any securities issued by the Bank (including any guarantee by the Bank, whether or not limited in scope) in connection with raising of funds for inclusion in the Bank's ordinary capital resources as defined in article 7 of the agreement and any securities guaranteed by the Bank as to both principal and interest to which the commitment in article 6, section 5, of the agreement is expressly applicable, shall be deemed to be exempted securities within the meaning of paragraph (a) (2) of section 3 of the Act of May 27, 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77c), and paragraph (a) (12) of section 3 of the Act of June 6, 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c). The Bank shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission such annual and other reports with regard to such securities as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate in view of the special character of the Bank and its operations and necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

(b) The Securities and Exchange Commission, acting in consultation with such agency or officer as the President shall designate, is authorized to suspend the provisions of subsection (a) at any time as to any or all securities issued or guaranteed by the Bank during the period of such suspension. The Commission shall include in its annual reports to Congress such information as it shall deem advisable with regard to the operations and effect of this section and in connection therewith shall include any views submitted for such purpose by any association of dealers registered with the Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New Jersey opposed to the bill?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa qualifies. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 7, your Banking and Currency Committee reported H.R. 12563, the Asian Development Bank bill. This action by the committee was taken after 3 days of legislative hearings on the bill by the International Finance Subcommittee. This subcommittee did such an outstanding job that I want to name them. Mr.

REUSS, of Wisconsin, is the chairman. Mr. MULDER, of New York; Mr. ASHLEY, of Ohio; Mr. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. GONZALEZ, of Texas; Mr. HANNA, of California; Mr. WHITE, of Idaho; Mr. OTTINGER, of New York; Mr. HALPERN, of New York; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan; and Mr. TALCOTT, of California were the members.

In the course of those hearings the subcommittee heard from representatives of the administration including the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler; Ambassador Averell Harriman; the Honorable David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development; representatives from the AFL-CIO, and the American Bankers Association. In addition to the endorsements from those individuals and groups, your committee has received letters endorsing this legislation from the Investment Bankers Association of America, the National Association of Manufacturers, the League of Women Voters, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and from Mr. Eugene Black, Special Adviser to the President on the Asian Bank.

The broad-based support for this legislation stems from the recognition of the urgent need to help the nations of Asia to build freedom. This bill authorizes the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the Asian Development Bank and authorizes that there be appropriated the full amount of the U.S. subscription of \$200 million. That this \$1 billion bank is a bank founded on Asian initiative and resources is amply demonstrated by the fact that the countries of Asia have already subscribed to \$647.8 million of the Bank's capital. The Asian Development Bank is designed to promote economic investment in the developing countries of Asia and thereby to expand the economic growth of the region. The Secretary of the Treasury has assured us that as the U.S. subscription to the Bank will be payable in five annual installments—the cash portion of such payment will be only \$10 million in each year—the subscription of the United States will have virtually no adverse effect upon our balance of payments.

As the President has sought a path to peace in Asia at his meetings in Honolulu so can we here and now reaffirm our commitment to economic growth and peace in Asia by enacting H.R. 12563. Such action by Congress will demonstrate the full vitality of the U.S. concept of peaceful development in Asia. Furthermore it will demonstrate to our Asian neighbors our unequivocal dedication to the peaceful growth of the countries of Asia.

I, therefore, urge the House to adopt this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around here for a few years, and I can remember when we were told that by the establishment of these international banks and lending agencies there would be established a climate throughout the world which

would lead the way to dispensing with the foreign aid giveaway program. Thereupon Congress created a number of these international financial institutions, some of them many years ago. But I see no diminution of the foreign giveaway program. Congress has simply added to the giveaway programs through these international banks. In other words, what we were told 10 and 15 years ago would develop from the establishment of these agencies has not come to pass. But today it is proposed to establish still another lending institution, and for what reason I do not know. This is ludicrous, this move here today, in the light of what has not happened under the assurances and guarantees that we were given in years gone by.

Bear in mind that this Asian Bank starts with a demand for \$200 million from the taxpayers of this country, an institution that is to be capitalized at \$1 billion. And, it should not be necessary for me to remind you that the \$200 million is just the beginning—just the crack in the door.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say this proposal would be ludicrous if it were not so serious from the standpoint of the outpouring of the money and the resources of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, would support this bill, for he has long railed at the independence of the Federal Reserve System. However, he seems to have no qualms about setting up still another international financial agency over which neither the Congress nor the citizens of this Nation have any real control.

You can read this bill backward and forward, and if it is not the most beautiful delegation of power, beyond the reach of the Congress of the United States, except for the authorizing of additional money, I do not know what it is.

I say again—and I emphasize the point—that I am really surprised that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency would take the position that he does with respect to this bill, in contrast to the position he takes with respect to the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I invite the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that the amount of money that would be authorized over the period of years will not be as much as the Federal Reserve's 12 banks spend in 1 year of the people's money; and, this is in the direction of peace.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about—

Mr. PATMAN. This will do it.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I am not talking about money. I do not care whether it is \$1, \$10 or \$100 million, at the moment. I am talking about the principle of this thing as compared with the gentleman's attitude toward the Federal Reserve. This is what I am talking about. The gentleman well knows—

Mr. PATMAN. This cannot be compared—

Mr. GROSS. Let us not sidetrack for the moment on the issue of the money involved.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest that this cannot be compared to the Federal Reserve. This is an entirely different institution. This is directed in the direction of peace in the world.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, I understand. Everything apparently is in the interest of peace in the world, but there does not seem to be any peace that can be purchased through handouts of American dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there are now seven or more international lending agencies, and with the exception of the Inter-American Bank, I do not know of a single one of these institutions that could not lend money to Asian countries.

If the members of the committee can tell me of any of these already existing international lending agencies, with the exception of the Inter-American Bank, that cannot loan money to the Asian countries, I would be glad to hear about it.

I reiterate, I do not understand the reason for the creation of this brand new bank when there are already a multiplicity of international banks, to which the United States has made available and pledged billions of dollars. I will not be surprised if, in due time, the House Committee on Banking and Currency brings to the floor of the House a bill to provide for an African bank. There are a number of tribes on the African continent that are not today properly financed. And, since the Russians have apparently demonstrated that a landing can be made on the moon, I suppose we can look forward to the day when the freewheeling spenders in this Government will want to establish a moon bank.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the amounts which some of the other countries allegedly are going to contribute to this Asian bank.

Vietnam the committee says is going to contribute \$7 million. Where does one suppose Vietnam is going to get \$7 million to contribute to the capital stock of this bank?

Where does one think Pakistan is going to get \$32 million to contribute to this bank?

Where does one suppose India—according to the report—is going to get \$93 million to contribute to this bank? They are busted institutions—these nations—and you know it. You know where the money is going to come from—the U.S. Treasury. So instead of \$200 million out of the taxpayers' pockets of this country, you start with \$200 million and Lord knows how much more.

Where do you suppose the British will get \$30 million to put into this thing?

Why, bless your hearts and souls, we have been supporting the British pound sterling to keep it from collapsing. Twice in the last year or year and a half, we have had to go to the rescue of the pound sterling. If they are in such good shape financially, why are we doing these

things? And what about the balance of payments and the drain on gold from this country by establishing still another bank with the accompanying outflow of dollars?

And whether you like it or not, the profiteers in Vietnam are reaching for all the gold they can get these days.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. There can be no outflow of gold under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how you would stop it. You tell me how you would stop the outflow of gold under the terms of this bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is part of the agreement in connection with the operation of this bank.

Mr. GROSS. It is what?

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to call your attention here to a sentence in the committee report:

Since it is not a monetary institution, the Bank could not utilize any of its dollars as a claim on U.S. gold stocks.

Mr. GROSS. Is that a provision in the bill itself or is that merely a statement in the report?

Mr. WIDNALL. It is in the report.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, that is what is hoped for by the committee—you hope that this will be the result.

Mr. WIDNALL. This is a factual statement.

Mr. GROSS. But our gold is leaving us and you know it. The gold will follow the dollars that we put out under this bill—not dollar for dollar—but it will go out under the terms of this bill and the gentleman well knows it.

What has happened as the result of the \$130 billion that this country has put out in foreign aid through the years? I come back to this point again—what has happened as a result of the \$130 billion that we put out in foreign aid? Why this bill? If the foreign aid program has been so good, why must we have still another new international lending agency? Incidentally, why is the charter for this bank to be deposited in the Archives of the defunct United Nations that today sits in New York unable to live up to its charter by suppressing aggression in Vietnam? Why would you want to see the charter of something worthy, if it is worthy, in the Archives of the United Nations? Why not deposit it in the Archives of the United States?

Mr. PATMAN. This was carefully considered by all the nations participating and that was their agreement. That is what they wanted. They voted upon these issues including the issue that the gentleman raises. The affected nations want it that way.

Mr. GROSS. I am so glad we are doing everything to please the foreign nations—

Mr. PATMAN. Including our own.

Mr. GROSS. I am so glad we are doing everything to please the foreign nations. We have already spent \$130 billion to please them, and now you come along with another international bank. Could the gentleman tell me how much

this Government has invested in the existing international banks?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for one question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has demonstrated fairness on the floor of this House many times and I commend him for it. I wonder if he would not be willing to yield to the Republican minority just a few minutes of time because they do not have any time and they would appreciate it.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman from Texas is probably as responsible as anyone else for bringing this up under suspension of the rules. The gentleman well knows what bringing a bill up under suspension of the rules means—a total of 40 minutes of debate—that 20 minutes of that time is supposed to go to the opposition.

If there are no other claims on the part of those opposing the bill, I will be glad to yield time to others on the minority side, but only in the event that no one in opposition to this bill wants time. You brought the bill up this way.

Mr. PATMAN. Since we are allocating our time now, would you give us some figure as to what time you are going to yield?

Mr. GROSS. I say it is a travesty in the name of the legislative process to bring up a bill of this magnitude under suspension of the rules, especially when the committee did not have the report on the hearings printed and available until yesterday. This is a monstrous legislative procedure, and now you ask me for time for the minority members who support the bill. Why did you not bring it up under a rule with ample time for debate and amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. The bill is before us here on the floor and it is a good bill. Would the gentleman be willing to indicate the time that you would be willing to yield?

Mr. GROSS. No, I would not be willing to indicate to the chairman of the committee the time that I am willing to yield for I do not know how many others wish to speak in opposition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am astonished that we have this thing here today. It is not listed on the list. This is not the regular suspension day. I am just wondering how it was gotten up here notwithstanding that none of us have had an opportunity really to give it any consideration. I do not understand a good many things in this bill in the first place—about the money that these other countries are going to put into it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not find anything of that nature in the bill. I have not had time to read it. But, gentlemen, this bill proposes to spend \$200 million of the American people's money. The Congress has had no notice that the

bill was going to come up. We have not even been afforded enough time to read the report. I do not like this kind of business.

Mr. GROSS. I think I can answer the gentleman's question. The money which the other countries will put up will be in rupees and piasters and the Lord knows what else.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should like to get an answer from the Chairman to that question. What kind of money will they put up?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], who is chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to have an answer from anybody who is able to answer the question.

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I am glad that the gentleman from Iowa has yielded in order to enable me to answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Virginia. Under the Asian Development Bank the United States would be able to generate more than \$1 billion worth of lending power for the undeveloped world with a contribution in cash over the 5-year period of \$50 million, and in a letter of credit another \$50 million, making a total of \$100 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the gentleman has misapprehended my question. I should like to get an answer to my question.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman's question was, who is putting up the money?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. Would it be rupees, piasters, or what?

Mr. REUSS. All countries would be required to put up one-half of their contribution in hard, convertible currencies and one-half of their contribution in their own currency.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What kind of currency would we put up?

Mr. REUSS. We would put it up in dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. 100 percent?

Mr. REUSS. Because we are fortunate enough to have a convertible currency. Those who are not so fortunate would put up half of the amount in their own currency.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It does seem to me that with as many questions as are raised about this proposal and as many banks as we are establishing all over the world for the benefit of countries that very often are on the other side of the fence, it seems to me that this measure should not come up in this sudden way without any opportunity for debate,

under a suspension of the rules. I hope that this motion will be voted down, and that the bill will come up in the regular way, so that it can be thoroughly considered, and Members will have an opportunity to read the hearings, the report and the bill, and handle this matter in the appropriate and usual way.

And do not forget that this is \$200 million more of the hard-pressed taxpayers' money.

Mr. GROSS. And the \$200 million is just a foot in the door.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would like to ask a question of the perpetrators of the bill. I should like to refer the gentleman from Wisconsin or the chairman of the committee that brings this bill to the floor of the House today to page 5 of the bill, section 11, paragraphs (a) and (b).

Paragraph (a) states:

Sec. 11. (a) Any securities issued by the Bank (including any guarantee by the Bank, whether or not limited in scope) in connection with raising of funds for inclusion in the Bank's ordinary capital resources as defined in article 7 of the agreement and any securities guaranteed by the Bank as to both principal and interest to which the commitment in article 6, section 5, of the agreement is expressly applicable shall be deemed to be exempted securities within the meaning of paragraph (a) (2) of section 3 of the Act of May 27, 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77c), and paragraph (a) (12) of section 3 of the Act of June 6, 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c). The Bank shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission such annual and other reports with regard to such securities as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate in view of the special character of the Bank and its operations and necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

It would ordinarily be considered and deemed as exempted securities.

Then in paragraph (b), after stating that the Bank shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission all these reports with regard to said securities, the bill provides that they may waive, after consultation with the President or any officer which he shall designate, the authorization to suspend the provisions of subsection (a) under general section 11.

First, why is the Securities and Exchange Commission in here?

Second, if we are going to put our hard-earned money up for the project, should they be exempted?

Third, why should the SEC have the opportunity, when their representatives did not even testify before hearings of the subcommittee, if they deemed it advisable, to waive all of the exemptions?

Mr. GROSS. I cannot answer the question.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an answer to the question?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. The reason for this section 11, which the gentleman from Missouri has just read, is simply this: The Asian Development Bank, when set up, will attempt, as it properly should, to raise money in the free capital markets of the world, including, with the consent of the United States, in this country. This provision allows the Securities and Exchange Commission to do what it is permitted to do in the case of similar offerings by the World Bank and by the Inter-American Development Bank, namely, to waive the usual registration requirements in view of its ability to examine the applications itself.

Mr. HALL. In other words, it is just copying and parroting the other seven institutions in which we are already participating and the language of the laws relating to them.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. As I gather from this very abbreviated debate today, the main reason for this bill being up is to give the Banking and Currency Committee some stance in foreign affairs, but since there is a requirement of a two-thirds vote I am going to state that I will vote against it, because Mr. Reuss has not convinced me in 30 minutes—that is not enough time for him to convince me—that we ought to do this.

I was out in the Far East for the first time this year since I have been in Congress, and I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the chairman that if this bill were for \$200 billion in hard currency you could not clean up the mess out there.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his pointed observation, and conclude by saying that it is probably a vain hope on my part that this bill will be defeated.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] and I ask if the gentleman will yield to me?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The question was brought up as to why this bill was brought up in this way. It was brought up this way under suspension of the rules procedure by unanimous consent on Monday. There was good attendance on the floor Monday. In fact, the gentleman from Iowa interrogated us about it. Finally he yielded to have this bill brought up by unanimous consent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The point I am making is that the chairman of the committee should never have asked—and I will go further and say that the leadership should never have granted—the move to ask unanimous consent to bring this bill up under a suspension of the rules.

We all understand what the situation is here this week. I did not want to be a party to bringing the House in on Thurs-

day or Friday of this week. It ought not to have been this way.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

I am sorry to hear my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] may not be with us on the vote on this bill. I am sorry he did not accept the invitation of the Committee on Banking and Currency to participate fully in the hearings and testimony on this matter, because we would have welcomed him there during the 3 comprehensive days of hearings that we had. I am sure that he would have been able to contribute something, and I hope that he will listen to the debate from here on out, because I know him to be a man of open mind and one that is possibly susceptible to persuasion here.

Mr. HAYS. That is not very probable.

Mr. REUSS. I am going to be very brief, Mr. Speaker, because I have the feeling that the Members of the minority, the Republican side of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, who voted unanimously in favor of this bill, may not have an opportunity to make their views clear on the floor here today.

The consideration of this legislation was a very wholesome and heartening performance by the great Banking and Currency Committee. As early as last June, when the first whispers of the Asian Development Bank were beginning to be heard, the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall], raised the question of whether the administration and the Treasury should not take the House Committee on Banking and Currency fully into their confidence. That was done. Last summer we heard from Mr. Eugene Black, Special Adviser to the President on the Asian Bank. Since then there has been the closest cooperation by both sides on the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Speaker, usually the founding of a financial institution does not provide a basis for an expression of the hopes of mankind in a better tomorrow. The creation of Asian Development Bank, however, symbolizes a new unity for peace and progress in a free Asia. The commitment of the United States to this project is further evidence of our desires for peace and stability in Asia. It is evidence of our recognition of our responsibility to share the bounty of our good fortune to meet the needs of friends. In this endeavor we have been joined by other capital exporting countries who have agreed to make significant subscriptions to the \$1 billion capital stock of the Bank. To date their subscriptions total \$350 million. The subscription of the United States is limited to \$200 million.

As Chairman PATMAN has already stated, we have been assured that the actual cash payment of \$10 million a year over a 5-year period will have virtually no adverse effect upon our balance of payments. In the long run it may be anticipated that our participation in the Bank will serve to increase the volume of our exports to the Asian countries. At the present time U.S. exports to the developing countries of Asia is in excess of \$2½ billion. The Bank's charter pro-

vides that procurement made pursuant to loans granted by the Bank will be restricted to member countries of the Bank. It is in this connection that we may expect, after the Bank gets underway, to realize an increase in our exports to Asia.

The establishment of this Bank will constitute a significant step toward regional economic cooperation. The benefits flowing from such institutionalized cooperation are amply demonstrated by the results of similar cooperative efforts in Western Europe following the end of World War II and at the present time in Latin America through the Inter-American Development Bank. Furthermore, the establishment of this Bank is fully consistent with our national policy of supporting the establishment of multilateral economic development institutions, such as the World Bank—IBRD—the International Finance Corporation and the International Development Association. In fact, this Bank incorporates all of the best features of those institutions. Like the IFC, it will make loans in support of private enterprise. Like the World Bank, it will make loans directly to governments for extensive projects and programs. And like IDA, through limited "special funds" of the Bank, it will make loans on terms which are more flexible and less burdensome than conventional loans. As a multilateral institution it will provide others, equally able and willing to make capital available, with the opportunity of sharing in the responsibility of insuring economic growth and eventual prosperity in Asia.

Of paramount importance in the establishment of the Bank is the principle of self-help. The countries of Asia have already agreed to subscribe in excess of \$647 million. Perhaps even more significant than the singular achievement of establishing the Bank itself is the commitment of the countries involved to expedite the economic and social development of the Asian region. Their determination to find solutions for the great unsolved economic problems of the region through regional initiative is at least as important as the assumption of the obligation to subscribe to the funding of the Bank.

For the developing countries of Asia, the founding of the Bank represents new hope for peace and economic stability. In committing ourselves to joining the Asian Development Bank, we demonstrate our understanding of the proud efforts of free peoples for economic independence. In this effort we choose to trust our hopes and not our fears.

I urge the House to adopt this bill.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12563, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

I think this is a good bill and one that deserves wide bipartisan support of the House.

It was not by accident that this bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. One would have to go all the way back to 1944, at the time of the Bretton-Woods

Conference which gave birth to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, to find an occasion when the Congress played such an active role in the conferences and discussions leading up to the drafting of a multilateral lending institution charter.

After President Johnson announced in his Baltimore speech last April that the United States would join with Asian countries in the proposed Asian Development Bank, our committee met in executive session with Special Presidential Adviser Eugene Black. Mr. Black confided with the committee to the fullest extent, advising us on all aspects of the then informal discussions in world capitals concerning the proposed Asian Bank. At the meeting with Mr. Black, the executive branch assured our committee that congressional staff representation would be welcomed at the preliminary meeting in Bangkok last October. Both the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees, as well as the House Banking and Currency Committee, were represented at that important meeting.

In addition, several members of our committee, together with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, were part of the official U.S. delegation to the charter signing meeting in Manila last December.

Therefore, when President Johnson sent the Asian Development Bank bill to Congress on January 18 of this year, your Committee was already fully familiar with the details and the reasons behind the proposed legislation. Unlike so many times in the past, this bill did not come to the Congress from the executive branch with a "take it or leave it" attitude—an attitude where the Congress is constrained to go along in every detail with international legislation or run the risk of precipitating a diplomatic crisis.

The attitude of "give and take" continued to prevail during the Subcommittee on International Finance hearings. Section 5(c) of the administration bill would have permitted this or any future administration to funnel an unlimited amount of traditional foreign aid through the Bank. Such funds would not have been subject to future congressional authorization. Last, but perhaps most important, they would have been administered by an institution where the United States retains only 17 percent control. Secretary Fowler made clear in his testimony that the Treasury Department would not object to the removal of section 5(c).

AID Director David Bell, who presumably would have administered funds authorized by this section, conceded that he would not object to amending the provision.

Accordingly, at the request of minority Members, and with the cooperation and understanding of the subcommittee chairman, section 5(c) was amended to our complete satisfaction.

With that needed change, we have, I believe, an excellent bill. A product of Asian initiative, the Asian Bank, when it commences operations will provide a badly needed regional forum for the economic development of that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has traveled through southeast Asia must realize that the political consequences resulting from Communist terror are exceeded only by the consequences resulting from hopeless economic deprivation. The Asian Bank will provide at least that spark of hope for a better future. Better yet, such economically advanced countries as Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, will be providing a great measure of the leadership in the new institution. Looking back to the other multilateral lending institutions in which the United States participates, it is refreshing indeed that the proposed Asian Development Bank will have 65 percent of its capital subscribed to by nations in the Asian area.

As was the case in postwar Greece, Turkey, Latin America, and Korea, the United States has always held to the concept that there is a better alternative available than war. The Asian Bank, starting out in an uncertain period of armed conflict in South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos, and border disturbances in India and Pakistan, will provide concrete evidence that the United States and other peace-loving nations—unlike Red China and North Vietnam—can look far beyond the firing of the next shell.

Our policy looks to the firing of the last shell, to a day when Asians can turn their energies to building a lasting peace.

Ours is a policy based upon the premise that American help, and not American blood alone, can better hasten that day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the Asian Development Bank bill.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in support of this bill on the Asian Development Bank. I might say that I grow very weary of these attacks on all international banking organizations. I for one Member of this House support not only this Asian Development Bank but I support the International Development Association and, yes, I support the Inter-American Development Bank, too. I say that because I want to tell you from my 6 years on this committee in the House I have found that these international organizations are just as well, if not better run than our own foreign aid program in many instances. I am sure from my contact with it that the Asian Development Bank will be run in just exactly the same way.

Now, what are we talking about here? For the first year \$10 million. That is exactly the cost of one B-52 in the South Pacific. What you are talking about here is \$10 million. I ask you as Members of the House, what is the alternative? If we do not have this Asian Development Bank, what are you going to do? What alternative have these Members suggested here on this side of the aisle today, and what alternative have they suggested on the other side, those who would attack this bill? Not one other alternative, because this is the

answer—to provide economic and development capital for these countries. This is a fair way to do it and the way that makes sense for the United States of America. I say we should not only do it in Asia, as is suggested here, but I have suggested to the administration that they consider it for Africa as well and that they consider it for other regions of the world as well. Mr. Speaker, I say that because that is the purpose of this bill, to get these countries to work together. We have been a long time since World War II trying to achieve this very thing. That is what this bill does. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House, do not turn your backs on it now but support this bill. It is not only good for America but one of the brightest hopes in bringing peace to this world, and that is what we all want.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the International Finance Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, because of the time allowed, I do not wish to reiterate the essentials of H.R. 12563. I am sure they are well known to all Members of the House; the President's message on this subject, as well as the special report of the Treasury Department, documents the agreement carefully, and we can add to this list the favorable report of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Let me say in general terms that I share the hope and promise of this proposed Asian Development Bank. It is an Asian institution, conceived by Asians to administer to Asian economic needs. To this purpose several developed states have pledged assistance. It seems to me that only by cooperative ventures such as this can the West provide development capital which avoids hurtful political strings, underlines our good faith, and helps to spoil the deceptive appeal of Communist revolutionary action.

As a member of the International Finance Subcommittee, I was privileged to hear expert testimony in behalf of this bill; the bulk of it augmented my earlier views obtained at Manila in December when some of us from the House and Senate attended the signing conferences and ceremonies. Even before last December, many of us were acquainted with the general pattern of the negotiations taking place, and at all times we were kept fully informed.

We should emphasize that the creation of this institution has been discussed for many years. It is an outgrowth of the work of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

H.R. 12563, it should be emphasized has been reported unanimously by our committee.

Let me address myself mainly to some of the criticism which has been voiced, both during the hearings and among some citizens' groups. The Asian Bank will not replace established and traditional sources of loans in Asia. It is designed to complement existing instruments. In all lending transactions, the Bank administrators will take into account accessibility elsewhere; and the

Bank will quite naturally cooperate with all the other lending institutions.

The Asian Bank will not encourage the growth of public facilities to the detriment of free enterprise. Its charter enables it to lend directly or to guarantee loans to private enterprises.

I want to emphasize Congress must approve any future additional subscriptions. Specific congressional authority must be solicited before the United States may legally vote for any increase in subscriptions.

I repeat what I said earlier: The impact of the American contribution on our balance of payments will be minimal. The \$100 million paid-in subscription is divided into five equal annual installments. Fifty percent of the first year's payment, which amounts to \$10 million, can be and will be deposited with a letter of credit. Hence, as the Secretary of the Treasury has testified, the only portion of each year's payment having a balance-of-payments effect will be the annual \$10 million in cash.

Moreover, 50 percent of our total commitment of \$200 million which must be made this year, is in callable shares; this is intended to afford the Bank sufficient backing so that it may borrow in the capital markets of the world; it is not anticipated that these callable subscriptions will in fact be utilized. It should be pointed out in this connection that no demands for the callable capital of either the World Bank or the Inter-American Bank have ever been placed.

I stress these points because I know that Members share my own reluctance to initiate programs which carelessly complicate our balance-of-payments problems, mitigating against the variety of voluntary and legislative restrictions now in effect. Under the Bank's charter, procurement of goods to be financed by the Bank is limited to member countries; the United States is a major trader in this part of the world; we have already established ourselves as a supplier of many of the capital goods which the Bank will conceivably finance; we are already a major exporter to potential borrowers of Bank funds. In long-range terms, I believe the Bank's engagements will have a favorable effect.

Let me add briefly, that provision has been made in the budget for appropriations authorized by H.R. 12563. A supplemental appropriation of \$120 million is expected if the House and Senate consent to H.R. 12563. Our contribution represents \$100 million in callable capital stock and \$20 million for the first year's paid-in installment. Subsequent appropriations of \$20 million will be sought for the years 1967 to 1970.

You will find this provision on page 73 of the Appendix to the Budget, 1967. One-half of the first year's \$20 million will be paid in in cash; the other \$10 million will be submitted by letter of credit.

The Asian Bank will be an Asian institution; it is emphatically not a sham, as some have suggested. It will not be a vehicle for American financial hegemony. Proportionate voting strength reflects this reality: seven members of the Board of Directors will be Asians, while only

three will be appointed from among the nonregional participants. The president of the organization will be Asian.

We have heard it contended that, despite this executive arrangement, and despite the fact that 65 percent of the total subscription will come from Asian members, that the United States, in practical terms, could conceivably dominate the entire venture through its unilateral aid programs.

This is not the case.

It should be noted, as far as this contention is concerned, that a majority of the Asian members are not now receiving American assistance, or otherwise are receiving it in limited fashion and for specified purposes. Countries such as Iran, Thailand, and the Philippines are fast approaching a stage of economic self-sufficiency which would obviate the need for further unilateral assistance.

Moreover, we should remember that the contribution to the success of the Bank does not depend exclusively on money. All of the Asian countries are going to be making contributions in expert personnel and manpower.

We have also heard some comment that the projects which the Bank will facilitate will encourage industrial and commercial development, to the disadvantage of the agricultural sector. In doing so, the Bank would be ignoring the vast and basic needs of the indigent population to a considerable degree. Moreover, such imbalance might in future years merely necessitate increased American food shipments.

Mr. David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, testified that, to the contrary, the President was placing the strongest emphasis upon agriculture in our economic aid transactions. Most of the projects which we identify with the Bank will be precisely the construction of facilities—dams, roads, and so forth—which can expand rural agriculture and increase incomes among low-income populations. Administrator Bell testified as follows:

I do not think there is any question at all but that this Bank will attach the same high priority to the agriculture sector that all of us want.

This emphasis is correct and valid because we want the Bank's capital to have an effect in rural areas, in the country areas, and among those vast portions of the populace which is suffering from basic human wants.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Asian Development Bank will underline our resolve to help the Asian peoples develop peacefully and independently. The impetus behind this new institution is sound and reassuring; it is based on the proposition of self-help and depends upon the initiative and will of Asians themselves. I am convinced that U.S. relations with Asian countries can be strengthened only insofar as we encourage cooperative economic ventures such as the Asian Bank, free from coercion or subservience, untainted by short-term political tangents and ambiguous ideological bickering.

This is an enterprise which will in large measure be run by Asians. It represents a fresh approach to the real

problems which these people confront, and I am hopeful of overwhelming endorsement by the House today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of this proposed legislation. It is a good program and there is not very much that has to be said.

It should be pointed out, however, that there are some potential problems inherent in the Asian Development Bank. One such problem is that the big westernized industrial powers—the United States, Japan, Australia, Britain, and Germany—may influence the Bank and try to put its emphasis on western-type projects which are not risky but which will not do much to raise the basic agricultural level of the people. The Asian powers may wind up being rather suspicious of the Bank—or at least not very interested in it—if it is primarily a marketing device for the products of the industrial powers.

Japan's influence in the new Bank will be important, and I think we can be sure that Japan has not pledged \$200 million—the same sum we pledged—out of kindness. For the Japanese, this is a major venture. I imagine they want to use the Asian Development Bank as a vehicle for Japanese trade expansion, and this is not the type of thing we want our money to be underwriting. This is something we must watch out for.

The only other thing I worry about is the limited American voting power. If we have 17 percent of the voting power, we do not have much. Normally, we would have little to worry about because significant Bank decisions will be made by a two-thirds vote. The United States, together with Britain, Germany, Japan, and Australia has about 48 percent of the vote. Today, however, we cannot rely on Britain, Germany, and Japan to support our Asian policy. In many respects, they fear our policies perhaps because of our lack of forthright policy statements. Before we put any large sums of money into this Bank, we must be able to better rely on the support of our allies for our Asian objectives.

We will do better among our allies when we reduce our credibility gap—when we show firmness and resolution in our worldwide defense policy and, above all, when we openly declare where we are and where we are going. We will not have the full cooperation we need from our allies until we formulate realistic long-range policies. I think the American people also have a right to expect long-range planning instead of short-range bumbling.

No one can tell me that the rush job we are doing on the Asian Bank bill today is an example of the administration "thinking ahead." I am all for this Bank, but the reason why we are rushing it through is not one of substance, but of show. It is another example of the big fanfare technique in which Hollywood showmanship is supposed to substitute for the lack of realistic, co-

ordinated long-range planning and policymaking. I hope this Bank's establishment will witness an end to showmanship and a beginning of candor, planning, and achievement in American-Asian policy.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I urge the Members to act favorably on H.R. 12563.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa is willing to use the remainder of his time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under a suspension of the rules it is not necessary to alternate time.

Does the gentleman from Texas have any further time he wishes to yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, we have further time, but it is customary and traditional—

Mr. GROSS. Why do you not go ahead and use it?

Mr. PATMAN. It is traditional that the one on the minority yield.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. A lot of things are traditional that have been broken today in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, why is it important to consider this legislation today? Mr. Speaker, I think this timing is significant. Yesterday at the Honolulu declaration America gave its pledge to help the people of South Vietnam build while they fight.

Yesterday at the Honolulu declaration the Vietnamese leaders gave a pledge to the people of South Vietnam of a policy of economic stability, and improved material welfare for the people. They also pledged the formulation of a democratic constitution and the creation of government, elected by the people.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation pending before us today supports the same goals.

It seeks to bring economic stability to South Vietnam and all free Asia.

It seeks to make the governments and the peoples of this region active partners and leaders in the campaign to build a basis for democratic institutions throughout free Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the Asian Development Bank legislation today could be the first step toward the establishment of a true and lasting peace throughout Asia.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes on our side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is another effort to get people throughout the world to help themselves. This is a truly cooperative effort on the part of the people in Asia to help themselves.

We are proposing to do it in the same manner that has worked so successfully for these many years.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of some of the protests against the operations of the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, and the International Development Association, no one has ever come before this House, or even off the floor, for that matter, with any suggestion as to how

we could improve their operations. They are doing a good job. This Asian Development Bank in this area will do the same kind of good job, bringing into it the people there who know their needs. All we are doing is helping them to help themselves.

In handling this bill, our Banking and Currency Committee has not invaded the jurisdiction of any other committee. Since the Bretton Woods Agreement we have properly considered all bills concerned with international banking.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency has always had jurisdiction over these international banks, and has properly exercised its jurisdiction and with the complete approval of the House as best evidenced by its unflinching support of the recommendations of that able committee.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is always welcome to appear before our committee to give his or her views. This bill comes out of our committee unanimously, and it deserves the unanimous support of this House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

As the gentleman from Michigan pointed out, this gives still another committee, in addition to the four or five that are making foreign policy now, a chance to operate in that field. But one of the shortcomings of this system was revealed by the gentleman who apparently does not know that there are six other international banks besides this. He has not been operating in foreign affairs long enough to become informed.

The gentleman talks about Vietnam. The Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning voted out a \$415 million supplemental bill, mostly for Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is just a question now of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought that this \$200 million drop in the bucket were going to solve the problems of the world, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], indicated, I would certainly vote for it, but I think it might even complicate it.

Mr. Speaker, the point of the matter is that we are dumping money out there a lot faster than those countries can absorb it.

I am going to offer some amendments at the proper time to the foreign aid bill, when the regular bill comes up. However, let me say this to you:

You can set up all the banks you want. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] talks about setting up a bank for Africa. That might be fine. But did any of you read the newspapers about what is going on in Africa? Have any of you heard what is happening in Nigeria? Have any of you read the paper this morning telling where the mayor of Nairobi is buying a \$30,800 Rolls Royce to ride around in. Where do they get this money? Sure, we spent a lot of money

in foreign aid when we had the Marshall plan in Europe and we were using it in an industrial area that had the know-how about running an industrial mechanism. And it worked, but when foreign aid went to other areas, and the President in his message recognized this, and some of us have been saying this for years—when they moved into the underdeveloped regions of the world, they thought the only thing we needed to do was to put in money—money—money and build factories and build plants and build steel mills. Then they found out that people with no education or with a first-grade education or a second-grade education and with no technical knowledge and with no technical know-how could not run these plants and they did not help them. That is why the thing has broken down and that is why the President is asking that the emphasis go on education and on technical training.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee that held hearings on this bill voted the bill out unanimously. The whole committee after reading the testimony of the subcommittee and hearing all the evidence voted the bill out unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this bill should not be passed. It will be of major help in the situation in southeast Asia. International banks have served a good purpose all over the world. This one in particular will serve a wonderful purpose. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] challenged those gentlemen who are opposing this bill to state an alternative. No reasonable alternative has been suggested. They just oppose it entirely without offering any alternative.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, no alternative has been suggested. At this point, I want to read to you a message from the President of the United States which was sent from Honolulu on Monday after the Banking and Currency Committee voted the bill out. While in Honolulu they realized the importance of this very important legislation. The President sent this telegram to the chairman of the committee. He said:

My thanks and congratulations for your prompt action on the Asian Development Bank bill. Please express my sincere thanks to your committee for their efforts have proven to be most helpful.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

This wire was sent from Honolulu last Monday night. The President of the United States asked us to implement what he is doing with this very deserving piece of legislation wherein we put up a few million dollars—\$50 million over a period of 5 years.

Through this, we are going to generate \$1 billion of spending power which will do nothing but good and help to bring peace in southeast Asia.

By unanimous consent granted on Monday the bill was postponed until today. There is nothing unfair about bringing the bill up this way because every Member of the House agreed to bring it up in this way today.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in recommending the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank, requests us to make a great step forward toward responsible participation in a sound economic undertaking—the Bank—which in turn will finance sound economic investments in Asia.

In his message, President Johnson said of the Bank:

It was needed yesterday. It is needed even more today. Tomorrow, when the demands of Asia's millions on her struggling economies are more pressing still, it can mean the difference between opportunity and chaos.

The formation of this Bank will provide hope to the people of Asia that their lives and the lives of their children can be productive and rewarding. It will develop an expectation that abject privation and famine will disappear from their communities. This Bank will constructively assist in achieving these hopes and meeting these expectations.

But neither the Bank by itself, nor any other infusion of capital by itself, can provide resources adequate to the task unless a policy toward population growth is established by many of the areas involved.

The President forcefully called our attention to this point in his remarks in Independence, Mo., on January 20, when he said:

Fourth, we will increase our efforts in the great field of human population. The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance. Each man and woman—and each nation—must make decisions of conscience and policy in the face of this great problem. But the position of the United States of America is clear. We will give our help and our support to nations which make their own decision to insure an effective balance between the numbers of their people and the food they have to eat. And we will push forward the frontiers of research in this important field.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, unanimously reporting out the bill, called attention to this problem in the report before the House today, when it said, in reference to operations of the Bank:

Furthermore, your committee recognizes that it is important that the Bank be fully aware of the manner in which rapid population growth may outrun the attempts to improve the economic well-being of the nations served by the Bank. Per capita income may well decline to a below-subsistence level in many of the areas served by the Bank in the absence of a population policy. Therefore your committee urges that the Bank give full consideration to these facts in planning projects and programs, and allocate part of its resources for the problems of population growth.

I consider this a clear message to the representative of the United States who will sit on the Board of Governors of this Bank.

With your indulgence, I should like to illustrate the urgency of the problem by using a few figures—rounded off for the sake of simplicity, but essentially accurate. The Bank's capitalization is \$1 billion, and it will serve about 1 billion people in southeast Asia. The population of the area served is increasing at

the rate of almost 3 percent per year—by 30 million people. Per capita income in the area is roughly \$80 per person per year. To maintain present subsistence incomes, therefore, the gross national product of these nations must be raised by around \$2.4 billion per year. Assuming the population growth mentioned above, and assuming a rate of return on investment of 15 percent, this will require an infusion of capital at the rate of \$16 billion every year, just to keep even with population growth. The overwhelming point is, therefore, that the total capital of this Bank is about one-sixteenth of that which is required just to keep present living standards from getting worse.

This is why no program—be it Asian Development Bank, private investment, AID, or something else—will help the problem of economic development in the absence of a population policy. This is why we would be raising false hopes and false expectations if we suggest this Bank will improve living conditions unless the countries have a population policy. If population is not controlled by voluntary means—by means acceptable to the moral, cultural, and individual beliefs of those living in Asia, as well as in other parts of the world—it will be controlled more and more by death due to famine and to secondary diseases associated with malnutrition. It is urgent that we recognize the point at this time: Without a decrease in the rate of population growth in the area which it serves, the Asian Development Bank is doomed to fail. This is what is meant by Dr. R. B. Sen, Director General of the FAO, who said:

The next 35 years, until the end of the century, will be a most critical period in man's history. Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of an unprecedented magnitude. We must be warned that in the present situation lie the seeds of unlimited progress or unlimited disaster, not only for individual nations but for the whole world.

We must recognize that this entire Bank will provide one-sixteenth of what is required for 1 year—less than 1 month's worth—of capital just to keep living standards even. This is why population policy is a prerequisite to the success of this Bank.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join our distinguished colleagues of the Committee on Banking and Currency in urging the enactment of legislation providing for U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have followed the steps leading to the establishment of this institution with close attention. I believe that the Bank, as presently constituted, will play an important role in furthering the economic development of Asia and the Far East. It will strengthen the cooperation between the free countries of that area. It will also provide a very convenient and useful vehicle for U.S. economic assistance to that vital area of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the Committee on Banking and Currency on the sound approach reflected in the legislation before the House today. I would like to comment specifically about sections 4 and 5 of H.R. 12563, which deal with the coordination of U.S. policy, with annual reports to the Congress, and with limitations on the authority of the executive branch to enter into agreements with the Asian Development Bank without further specific congressional authorization.

Section 4 of the bill, dealing with coordination and reporting, is of particular interest to us because it continues congressional oversight of the new Bank on a systematic annual basis. This type of oversight will be helpful in establishing the type of constructive relationship between the Bank and the Congress as may lead, in time, to the enlargement of U.S. participation in that institution's program.

With respect to section 5, I was very pleased to notice that the Committee on Banking and Currency has included language in the bill which limits the financing, other than the initial subscription, which may be provided by the executive branch to the Asian Development Bank. The \$1 million a year limitation is certainly much more reasonable than the open-ended authority requested by the executive branch. With this limitation in effect, we can be certain that the consent of the Congress will be sought before any additional, sizable amounts of money will be channeled through the Bank to the region of Asia and the Far East. In this manner, the Congress will also have the opportunity to determine the conditions under which any additional assistance will be furnished through the medium of this Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and particularly of the Subcommittee on the Far East will continue to watch the progress of this legislation and the operations of the Asian Development Bank. I hope that this legislation will be enacted promptly and I will certainly support it.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am on the Banking and Currency Committee. I voted to report out the bill to authorize U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

I approve this type of foreign aid. It is far better, it seems to me, to assist other nations to help themselves by multilateral loans and the use of banking techniques and disciplines rather than direct outright gifts and grants to the heads of foreign governments.

Nevertheless, I deplore the parliamentary device of calling this bill up suddenly, without adequate notice, on the suspension calendar. The sum of \$200 million is too much to authorize in such an unparliamentary manner.

Passage by the House a few days or weeks early will not enable the Asian Bank to become operative any sooner. Good ideas will survive proper parliamentary procedures.

The sole reason for the rush is to permit the Banking and Currency Committee to participate in the Honolulu

conference and to fortify the administration promises to Vietnam. But Vietnam is only one small participant in the Asian Development Bank. This bill is good enough to withstand the opposing arguments. This bill is good enough to be debated under the regular calendar.

This bill is good enough to be passed by the Congress. But it should be considered in cooperation and in coordination with all other foreign aid bills.

All Members should have an opportunity to know, understand, and debate the issues involved in this bill. This is not provided under suspension of the rules of the House.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of American participation in the Asian Development Bank.

Official statements issued at the close of the recent Honolulu conference are evidence that our national leaders are fully aware that the war in southeast Asia will never be won until economic stability and a reasonable standard of living becomes a reality for all the people of that region. The Asian Development Bank will be a major step toward accomplishment of this objective—peace in southeast Asia.

The kind of service offered under the Development Bank, through helping Asian nations help themselves, could ultimately eliminate the reliance of these nations on direct outside assistance such as our foreign aid program. Through helping these countries build their economies, they are given an opportunity to become trading partners rather than aid recipients. Although only a start, if administered properly this program could materially contribute to the self-help concept which in the long run is the only true way for a nation to build itself.

The Asian Development Bank is a long overdue step toward a sharing of the responsibility for helping less fortunate nations by those who have achieved industrial maturity and have in the past abdicated this responsibility, leaving the burden of assistance solely in the hand of the United States.

Indeed, Japan, the most highly industrialized of Asian countries, will share an equal subscription of \$200 million with the United States. Germany and the United Kingdom will provide a substantial \$30 million each, while Canada and Italy will provide \$25 million and \$20 million, respectively. Loans to Asian nations, so vital to the development of the modern economy essential to a reasonable standard of living, will be made at rates comparable to those charged by international lending institutions. The Asian Development Bank will be built on an economically sound basis.

But perhaps more important, the Bank will be further evidence that the true friends of the emerging nations of Asia are not the Communists who, by subversion, terror, and violence seek to impose their vision of government and man's role in it upon weaker nations, but those nations of both hemispheres who have become prosperous and powerful because of their dedication to the democratic way and are willing to share the benefits of freedom with their fellow man to enable

him to rise to a position of equality—a God-given right.

Mr. Speaker, individual effort, the competitive system, the right of free choice under a stable government, has brought this Nation to the prominence it enjoys today. Most of the nations this legislation is designed to help have ample natural resources. What is needed is the money and skills to develop those resources. The Asian Development Bank could help provide a start toward these needed ingredients.

Communism finds its greatest fulfillment through empty bellies. The proposal we consider today could help take away from our adversaries the opportunity to thrive on the misery of their neighbors.

We are bringing into fruition that which has been but an idle promise in the past—assistance which is meaningful and which can establish goals for peace, so that the causes of the present struggle are eliminated and that a lasting peace is more than a distant dream.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Asian Development Bank offers an opportunity for development in an area of the world that has too often known destruction. It offers a path for growth to people who have too commonly known despair, and I rise in support of this legislation which would authorize the United States to participate actively in its work.

This Bank, quite properly, is Asian. The initiative was Asian. The organizing group was Asian, and two-thirds of its financing will be Asian. But the significance of meaningful growth and development, which looks beyond the present fighting in Vietnam, is far more than Asian.

The best hope for long-term peace and stability in southeast Asia lies in the coordinated type of regional development called for by this Bank. It is a call which this country, with its deep commitment to the improvement of man's opportunities, cannot and must not resist.

The Asian Development Bank will expand opportunities in the area stretching from Iran to Samoa. It will make loans for projects to supplement other sources of credit. It will give emphasis to programs that are regional in scope. It will assist countries to formulate their own development programs, and it will cooperate in many other practical ways. Certainly these are objectives and practices which we can support.

The charge has been made that a contribution by the United States of \$200 million would adversely affect our balance-of-payments situation. This simply is not true. The Treasury Department, as a matter of fact, conducted a special study on this matter and reported that any impact "will be minimal at most and the longer range probability is for no net balance-of-payments cost."

The proposed Bank can make an important contribution and open new doors to what is being done to help the Asian Nations. It is not, as President Johnson has so correctly pointed out, a luxury but a necessity. It would have been valuable yesterday. It would be even more valuable today, and it will be abso-

lutely essential tomorrow when the demands of Asia's millions become even more pressing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank receive the overwhelming support of the Congress.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote with me in approving U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank thereby joining with 19 countries of Asia and 11 nonregional developed countries in helping Asians to help themselves.

It should be clear to all that there is no better time than now when the eyes of the world are focused on the U.S. efforts in Vietnam to demonstrate our genuine desire for peaceful development in Asia. Our actions today can show that we are looking beyond the time when the fighting will cease and every resource will be needed for reconstruction and development.

We all know that the countries of Asia are a long way from realizing their economic potential. But the peoples of Asia want to progress—to work, educate, heal, and feed the hundreds of millions of human beings who make up their ever-growing populations. Only with healthy, viable economies can they do this. Surely we cannot turn away when they have asked our help.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is economically practical and desirable for the United States to become a charter member of the Asian Development Bank.

The lending of this institution will complement and extend the effectiveness of our own economic assistance to Asia. The countries of that region will be contributing 65 percent of the authorized capital of the Bank giving real meaning to their commitment to their own idea of regional cooperation for development. Of no small importance is the promise this Bank gives of assisting private enterprise development in that area as well as development of public facilities.

Our subscription to the capital stock of the bank is \$200 million and represents 20.2 percent of total subscriptions and 30.6 percent of total subscriptions of developed countries alone. Of course, the bill we are voting on contains essentially the same provisions as those contained in the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and the Inter-American Development Bank Act relative to certain actions which may be taken only with specific congressional authorization.

The Congress would have to approve any increase in the subscription of the United States to the Bank, acceptance of any amendment to the Bank agreement which would increase the obligations of our country or change the purpose or functions of the Bank and approve any loan by the United States to the Bank except for limited technical assistance grants to the Bank by an agency already authorized to do so.

Special note should be made that the Banking and Currency Committee was particularly careful to consider any effect on our balance of payments by participation in the Bank. In this regard, the Secretary of the Treasury assured

the committee that participation is consistent with our overall balance-of-payments program and capabilities.

It is my deep feeling, Mr. Speaker, that our country must play an active role in this great undertaking from the very beginning and I hope my colleagues will vote overwhelmingly to do this.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support passage of H.R. 12563, the Asian Development Bank, and am proud to be one of the cosponsors of this bill. It reflects the kind of approach to the problem of emerging nations that will, in the long run, be most effective. It infringes least on the nationalist sentiments which are so strong as many of the newly independent countries.

The Asian Development Bank can make funds available for economic development on a loan basis. This is obviously of great financial benefit to the nations which must raise capital to finance infant industries with minimum cost to those who provide these funds. The United States has demonstrated over the years its desire to aid nations in need without trying to control these nations or their economies. In effect, the Asian Development Bank provides multilateral assistance from the countries which invest money in the Bank while the dignity and integrity of the borrowers is above attack.

I am convinced that healthy, stable economies help make for stable nations and stable international relations. This, in fact, is the basic reason for our foreign aid programs generally. The Asian Development Bank will help promote such economies.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12563?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that, in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds had voted in the affirmative and the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 292, nays 80, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—292

Adams	Bingham	Cederberg
Adabbo	Boggs	Chamberlain
Albert	Bolling	Chelf
Anderson, III.	Bolton	Clark
Anderson,	Brademas	Clausen,
Tenn.	Brook	Don H.
Annunzio	Brown	Clawson, Del
Arends	Brown, Calif.	Cleveland
Ashley	Burke	Clevenger
Aspinall	Burton, Calif.	Cohelan
Ayres	Eyrne, Pa.	Conable
Bandstra	Cabell	Conte
Barrett	Callan	Conyers
Bates	Cameron	Cooley
Beckworth	Carey	Corbett
Bell	Carter	Corman
Bennett	Casey	Cralley

Culver	Jennings	Qule
Curtis	Joelson	Race
Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Redlin
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Okla.	Rees
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
de la Garza	Jonas	Reifel
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Reinecke
Dent	Jones, Mo.	Resnick
Denton	Karsten	Reuss
Diggs	Karth	Rhodes, Pa.
Dingell	Kastenmeyer	Rivers, S.C.
Dole	Kee	Rivers, Alaska
Donohue	Keith	Robison
Dow	Kelly	Rodino
Duncan, Oreg.	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Dwyer	King, Utah	Rogers, Fla.
Dyal	Kirwan	Ronan
Edmondson	Kluczynski	Rooney, N.Y.
Edwards, Calif.	Kornegay	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, La.	Krebs	Rosenthal
Erlenborn	Kunkel	Rostenkowski
Evans, Colo.	Landrum	Roybal
Evins, Tenn.	Leggett	Rumsfeld
Fallon	Lennon	Ryan
Farbstein	Lipscomb	St Germain
Farnley	Long, Md.	St. Onge
Farnum	Love	Saylor
Fascell	McCarthy	Scheuer
Feighan	McClary	Schisler
Findley	McDade	Schmidhauser
Fino	McDowell	Schneebeil
Fogarty	McFall	Schwelker
Foley	McGrath	Selden
Ford,	McVicker	Senner
William D.	Macdonald	Shipley
Fountain	MacGregor	Shriver
Fraser	Machen	Sickles
Frelinghuysen	Mackay	Sikes
Friedel	Mackie	Slack
Fulton, Pa.	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Fulton, Tenn.	Mahon	Smith, N.Y.
Gallagher	Mailliard	Stafford
Garmatz	Mathias	Staggers
Gettys	May	Stalbaum
Gilbert	Meeds	Stanton
Gilligan	Michel	Stephens
Gonzalez	Miller	Stratton
Goodell	Minish	Stubblefield
Grabowski	Mink	Sweeney
Gray	Mize	Talcott
Green, Oreg.	Moeller	Taylor
Green, Pa.	Monagan	Teague, Calif.
Greigg	Moore	Tenzer
Grider	Moorhead	Thompson, N.J.
Griffiths	Morgan	Thompson, Tex.
Grover	Morris	Todd
Gubser	Morrison	Trimble
Hagen, Calif.	Morse	Tunney
Halpern	Mosher	Tupper
Hamilton	Moss	Tuten
Hanley	Multer	Udall
Hanna	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Hansen, Iowa	Natcher	Van Deerlin
Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi	Vanik
Harvey, Mich.	Nelsen	Vigorito
Hathaway	O'Hara, Ill.	Vivian
Hawkins	O'Hara, Mich.	Weltner
Hechler	Olsen, Mont.	Whiteley
Helstoski	Olson, Minn.	White, Idaho
Henderson	O'Neill, Mass.	White, Tex.
Herlong	Ottinger	Whitener
Hicks	Patman	Widnall
Hollfield	Patten	Wilson
Holland	Perkins	Charles H.
Horton	Phillbin	Wolf
Hosmer	Pickle	Wright
Howard	Pike	Wyatt
Hungate	Pirnie	Wydler
Huot	Poage	Yates
Hutchinson	Price	Young
Irwin	Pucinski	Younger
Jacobs	Purcell	Zablocki

NAYS—80

Abbutt	Collier	Haley
Abernethy	Colmer	Hall
Adair	Cramer	Halleck
Andrews,	Cunningham	Hardy
George W.	Curtin	Harsha
Andrews,	Dague	Hays
Glenn	Derwinski	Hull
Ashbrook	Devine	Ichord
Ashmore	Dickinson	Jarman
Baring	Dorn	King, N.Y.
Belcher	Downing	Langen
Betts	Dulski	Latta
Brown, Ohio	Duncan, Tenn.	Long, La.
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	McCulloch
Broyhill, Va.	Everett	McMillan
Buchanan	Fisher	Marsh
Burleson	Flynt	Martin, Ala.
Burton, Utah	Gathings	Mills
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Minshall
Ciancy	Gurney	O'Konski

O'Neal, Ga.	Satterfield	Walker, Miss.
Poff	Secrest	Walker, N. Mex.
Pool	Smith, Calif.	Watkins
Quillen	Smith, Va.	Watson
Randall	Steed	Whitten
Reid, Ill.	Tuck	Williams
Roberts	Utt	
Rogers, Tex.	Waggonner	

NOT VOTING—59

Andrews,	Giaino	Pelly
N. Dak.	Gibbons	Pepper
Baldwin	Griffin	Powell
Battin	Hagan, Ga.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Berry	Hansen, Idaho	Roncallo
Blatnik	Harvey, Ind.	Roudebush
Boland	Hébert	Roush
Bow	King, Calif.	Scott
Bray	Laird	Sisk
Broomfield	McEwen	Skubitz
Cahill	Martin, Mass.	Springer
Callaway	Martin, Nebr.	Sullivan
Celler	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	Matthews	Thomas
Dawson	Morton	Thomson, Wis.
Dowdy	Murphy, N.Y.	Toll
Ellsworth	Murray	Watts
Flood	Nix	Willis
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Brien	Wilson, Bob
Fuqua	Passman	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Matthews and Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Celler and Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Cahill and Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Callaway against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota and Mr. Mor-ton for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Griffin and Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Laird against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Giaino with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Roncallo.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Roush.

Mr. Scott with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1966, on rollcall No. 13 I voted "present." I did so because I own national bank stock that could possibly be benefited by the legislation. I wish to avoid any possibility of an appearance of a conflict of interest.

RAILWAY LABOR ACT
AMENDMENTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 707, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 707

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 706) to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and, pending that, yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 707 provides for consideration of H.R. 706, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Under existing procedures prescribed in the Railway Labor Act, railroad employees who have grievances sometimes have to wait as long as 10 years before a decision is rendered on their claim. In addition, after an employee has obtained an award, in some instances the carrier concerned refuses to pay the

award, in which case the employee is forced to go to court where he is then required to try his case all over again.

The purpose of H.R. 706 is to eliminate the backlog of undecided claims of railroad employees pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board and to provide equal opportunity for judicial review of awards of this Board to employees and employers.

The bill provides for the establishment, upon the request of a representative of management or of labor, of special boards for the adjudication of grievances arising under collective-bargaining agreements in the railroad industry. The bill would also provide for judicial review of orders of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and of boards established under this legislation, relating to minor disputes in the railroad industry. These disputes would be limited to the determination of questions traditionally involved in arbitration legislation; also, whether the tribunal had jurisdiction of the subject of the determination.

The National Railroad Adjustment Board was established in 1934 to provide a machinery for resolving disputes arising in the railroad industry between individual employees and the carriers. These disputes concern rates of pay, rules, or working conditions.

The Board consists of 36 members: 18 representatives of labor and 18 representatives of management.

From its establishment in 1935 through June 30, 1964, all divisions of the Board disposed of a total of 55,356 cases, of which 19,735 were withdrawn for settlement on the properties or for other disposition. In addition, from 1949 through May 1965, over 609 special boards of adjustment were established by agreement between individual carriers and individual unions, which rendered awards in over 35,600 cases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 707 in order that H.R. 706 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 707 will provide an open rule, with 2 hours' debate, for the consideration of H.R. 706, the Railway Labor Act Amendments.

The purpose of the bill is to eliminate the heavy backlog of undecided claims of employees before the National Railroad Adjustment Board—NRAB—and to provide equal opportunity for judicial review of award-decisions to both employers and employees.

The bill provides for the establishment, upon request of either labor or management, of special boards for the adjudication of grievances arising from collective bargaining agreements. Presently, the NRAB is a 36-man board, divided into 4 divisions, each responsible for certain phases of railroad operation. Membership is equally divided between labor and management. Workloads are uneven because of the fact that some areas are more susceptible of grievances than

others. One division is current, one about a year behind, another 3½ years behind, and the last about 7½ years behind.

Special boards have been used in the field in the past and have been successful. However, the act as presently written will not permit a broad-range operation. This bill seeks to remedy the problem. The amendment sought will permit the establishment of a special board whenever a representative of management or labor requests it. One member from each interest will then meet and formally agree what disputes may be heard by such board. If no agreement can be reached, NRAB shall name a third, impartial member to resolve the impasse. Once such board is established and its authority defined, all disputes arising from the operation of the carrier and its employees which would normally be referred to the NRAB will go to the special board. Additionally, cases already referred to NRAB which have been pending for a year or more may be referred to the special board.

The bill also affects the area of judicial review of Board decisions. Presently, if an employee receives an award from NRAB, the carrier affected can obtain review of such determination by refusing to pay the award; if an employee fails to get an award he has no way to have such decision reviewed. This one-sidedness is removed by H.R. 706. Review will be limited to areas traditionally open for inspection by a district court in reviewing arbitration decisions: the jurisdiction of the board of the subject matter, the compliance with all statutory requirements, and whether or not fraud on the part of the board is present.

Although there are no minority views in the report, Mr. Speaker, the Association of American Railroads has expressed opposition to the legislation. Their opposition is mostly against section 2, which will eliminate judicial review except as I previously mentioned. They state that judicial review has only been used approximately 50 times in 32 years. That thousands of awards have been paid.

They claim that the Adjustment Board procedures are loose and informal, with no sworn testimony ordinarily, with no right of cross-examination and confrontation of witnesses, no transcript, and with evidence normally consisting of written submissions of the parties. That to make these findings final and binding is a denial of due process of law.

They further claim that changing the right of judicial review will not help to solve the purpose of the bill—which purpose is to reduce the case backlog, particularly in division four of the National Railroad Adjustment Board. They further claim that it will be possible to create hundreds of the special adjustment boards, which could present a problem from the standpoint of the availability of competent personnel, and the added cost to the Government. And that, rather than reducing the number of cases, it could result in a substantial increase.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objections to the rule, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to observe that I am pleased that this bill comes to the House under a rule providing for 2 hours of general debate and wide open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. That action is in strange and sharp contrast to the bill which the House just approved—the initial outlay of \$200 million for an Asian Development Bank.

I would hope that when a bill to provide for a bank in Africa comes to the House, as I am sure it eventually will—the House of Representatives apparently having little or no regard for the debt and deficit of this Nation—when that bill comes in, I hope it will come in under a rule providing for adequate consideration. I would hope, too, that when the move is made to establish a bank on the moon, now that the Russians have landed there and I am sure we will soon be called upon to establish a bank for the development of the moon, that that measure will come in under a rule so the House can work its will.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILWAY LABOR ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 706) to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 706), with Mr. HANNA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first that the two gentlemen who preceded me from the Rules Committee made a very fine explanation of what the bill is in-

tended to accomplish. They gave the intent and purposes of the bill and the background of it very fully.

First, I would like to thank the members of the subcommittee who served in considering the bill. We had quite extensive hearings. Also, I want to thank all the members of the full committee because we had several executive sessions in trying to thrash out exactly what should come to the House.

I believe I would be remiss if I did not say that a great deal of the credit for this bill's being here today belongs to the man whose name is on the bill, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Mississippi introduced this bill and similar bills in previous Congresses. In the 88th Congress there were 4 days of hearings. He reintroduced the bills in this Congress and we held 3 days of hearings, both morning and evening, as I recall, on them. There were many executive sessions in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and this bill came out of the full committee by a voice vote.

Almost all of the objections were ironed out before it was reported.

This bill is intended to deal with a problem on the National Railroad Adjustment Board under which railroad employees who have a grievance arising out of violations of work rules or collective bargaining agreements have to wait as much as 10 or more years before receiving a decision on their grievance. The bill also contains provisions equalizing existing provisions of law relating to judicial review of these decisions.

The problem the bill is directed at goes back to amendments to the Railway Labor Act passed in 1934, creating the National Railroad Adjustment Board. This Board was established to hear and decide disputes involving railway employees' grievances and questions concerning the application and interpretation of collective bargaining agreements. These disputes are usually referred as "minor disputes," although in some instances such a dispute may involve several hundred people. A "minor dispute" arises after a collective bargaining agreement has been negotiated or is in existence and the parties are unable to agree either to the meaning or proper application of its terms with reference to a specific situation.

Over the more than 30 years in which this Board has been in existence, the types of cases which are "minor disputes" have become quite well understood in the railroad industry. The law—section 3(i) of the Railway Labor Act—provides that these disputes "shall be handled in the usual manner up to and including the chief operating officer of the carrier designated to handle such disputes; but, failing to reach an adjustment in this manner, the dispute may be referred by petition of the parties or by either party to the appropriate division of the Adjustment Board."

The Adjustment Board consists of equal representation of labor and management who, if they cannot dispose of the dispute may select a neutral referee to sit with them and break the tie. If they cannot agree upon a referee, the act provides that the National Mediation

Board shall appoint a referee to sit with them and dispose of the dispute.

The Supreme Court has stated that the provisions dealing with the Adjustment Board are to be considered as compulsory arbitration in this limited field (*Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago River and Indiana Railroad Co.* (353 U.S. 30)).

The Adjustment Board consists of four divisions, with the jurisdiction of each division spelled out in the law. From its establishment in 1935 through June 30, 1964, all divisions of the Board disposed of a total of over 55,000 cases. In addition, from 1949 through May 1965, over 609 special boards were established by agreement and these boards rendered awards in over 35,000 cases, or an average of 58 cases per special board.

The performance of the various divisions of the Adjustment Board has been somewhat spotty. The fourth division which has jurisdiction over a very small number of employees remains current in its work; the second division, which also has jurisdiction over a relatively limited number of employees has a backlog of only a little over 1 year's work. The third and first divisions which have jurisdiction over the overwhelming majority of railroad employees have very substantial and serious backlogs of work. The third division is over 3½ years behind and the first division is over 7½ years behind in its work.

Since it takes a minimum of 6 to 9 months for a case to be handled on the properties of a railroad, and usually takes considerably longer, this backlog of work facing the third and first divisions can lead to employees having to wait 8 to 10—sometimes 12—years before their case is finally decided.

If a case involves dismissal or suspension of an employee, the case is expedited, but the process is so slow that it is almost a farce to call the procedure expedited since it frequently takes as much as 2 years for a decision to be reached from the date the grievance initially arose in cases of suspension or dismissal.

The bill proposes to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide machinery to dispose of this backlog of work and to prevent such a backlog from arising again in the future. The method by which this is to be accomplished is by providing that special boards may be created on the property of individual carriers at the request of either management or labor. As I mentioned earlier, there have been over 600 of these boards created since 1949 which have disposed of 35,000 cases.

When a request is made for the establishment of such a Board, the bill provides that the other party must enter into such an agreement within 30 days. If the other party does not appoint a person to serve on the Board then the National Mediation Board will designate the person to serve, and in the event of a deadlock between the representative of the union and the representative of the carrier over procedural or other matters, then the National Mediation Board will appoint a neutral person to sit with the Board and determine these questions.

The cases which will be considered by these boards may be cases which will arise after the Board's establishment, cases which have already arisen but which have not been referred to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and cases which have been referred to the Adjustment Board and have been there for 12 months or more. Of course, the agreement establishing the special board may limit the cases to be heard beyond those just specified.

The same provisions of law as apply to special boards created by agreement will apply to special boards established under this legislation—in the event of a deadlock of cases considered by the special board, the National Mediation Board, shall upon request, appoint a neutral who will resolve the dispute before the Board.

The bill also modifies a provision of existing law so as to make all decisions of the National Railroad Adjustment Board final, and the bill provides for limited judicial review of these awards upon the request of any person aggrieved by the award. Existing law states that all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board "shall be final except insofar as they contain a money award." It has been only recently that the provisions of law making these awards final has been really sanctioned by the courts.

In the Gunther case, decided last December, the Supreme Court stated that the district courts may not look behind any portion of an award made by the National Railroad Adjustment Board except for the purpose of considering the correctness of the monetary portion of the award. Our committee could see no reason for making a distinction between an award for money and an award not involving money insofar as finality is concerned, so we deleted this provision from the law.

Under the bill as reported, all decisions of the Adjustment Board are final and may not be reviewed by the courts except on the grounds specified in the law which, as set out in the bill we are considering today are the following:

- (1) Failure of the division to comply with the requirements of the Railway Labor Act;
- (2) Failure of the order of the division to conform, or confine itself, to matters within the scope of the division's jurisdiction, or
- (3) Fraud or corruption by a member of the division making the award.

This same limitation on judicial review applies, of course, to the special Boards created under the legislation. Under existing law, a most unfair situation occurs. If an employee obtains an award from the Board, the carrier affected by the award can refuse to comply with the award, and the employee's only remedy is to go to court with the delays and uncertainties inherent in the judicial process. If, however, the employee loses his case before the National Railroad Adjustment Board, he has no judicial remedy at all—he cannot sue the railroad on his claim, and he cannot obtain judicial review of the decision of the Board.

Since this process for the settlement of minor disputes amounts to compulsory arbitration in this limited field, it is the feeling of our committee that the re-

view prescribed for these awards should be that generally prescribed for awards of arbitration tribunals; that is, decisions may be reversed by the courts only if they find that the Board has failed to conform to the law, that its order is outside its jurisdiction, or that fraud or corruption has occurred. The bill, therefore, limits the judicial review currently available to carriers, and expands the review available to employees, so that each side is entitled to obtain review of Board decisions on these three grounds and these three grounds only.

Hearings were held on this legislation for 4 days during the last Congress and were held 3 days during this Congress.

The bill received several days consideration in executive session of the subcommittee, and of our full committee. All sides agree that the existing situation on the National Railroad Adjustment Board is a serious one which requires correction. Three Presidents have attempted to deal with this situation through administrative action, but the backlog of work continues. It appears that legislation is necessary and we feel that the bill being considered today provides machinery which will eliminate the existing backlog and will prevent the same sort of situation arising again in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I think the bill is a good one and one which has been given very careful consideration. I commend it to the Members of the House for their consideration and vote.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the Railroad Adjustment Board was organized to dispose of minor disputes arising under railway labor contracts. It is a system of compulsory arbitration and has been so recognized by the courts. It was designed to leave the adjustment machinery in the hands of the parties concerned. The unions named their representatives to the various divisions of the Adjustment Board and management did likewise. The costs of the system are borne by both parties.

On paper this seems like a very sensible system to dispose of minor disputes which should be resolved without jeopardizing a carefully devised, complicated, and long-term labor contract. It has been held that such a system removes the right to strike to solve such grievances. It certainly was also intended to make unnecessary the resort to court action.

In the beginning the Railroad Adjustment Board functioned this way but over the years it has broken down. Now nearly every case, at least in two of the divisions, is automatically deadlocked and it becomes necessary for the National Mediation Board to appoint a neutral party who, for all intents and purposes, must personally settle the case. The presence of the labor and management personnel on the Board is of no help. The result has been increasing delay, more law suits and bitter disappointment in the system. It has proved, in fact, most unsatisfactory.

SPECIAL BOARDS

The law has always provided that the parties to a minor dispute or a series of

minor disputes could agree to convene a board at the site of the dispute, both parties being willing. Because of the mounting case backlogs in Chicago many railroads and many unions used this alternative device to avoid the adverse effects of delay. Where good will and commonsense prevail an agreement could be reached. This method is a good solution to the problem but unfortunately there are always those who prefer to do things the hard way. This bill would make the special board available in any case where either side wished to use it.

After considering this matter at great length in both the last Congress and this one, your committee feels that amending the law by this bill would have an influential effect in reducing the backlog of cases which has piled up in Chicago. For one thing, you will note that the bill provides for pulling a case back from Chicago to a special board if it languishes for a year.

Something that is not too well understood about the use of special boards might well be explained here. A special board need not hear but one case. It can be agreed and under this bill machinery is provided to determine the extent of the jurisdiction of any given board. It is most likely, therefore, that a special Board once established will hear all of the cases of a certain type arising between one of the brotherhoods and one of the railroads. It may even be agreed that it will hear all cases arising between members of a specific union employed by a particular railroad. So we see that the device is far broader in its scope and capable of handling a large number of cases without an undue proliferation of special Boards.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

As the law now stands, the right to a court review of an award given by either the Adjustment Board in Chicago or a special Board is an entirely one-sided affair. If the employee loses the first round, he has lost the bout. There is no way that he can obtain a review of that decision. If, on the other hand, he obtains an award, he may or may not have won. The railroad by refusing to comply with the award forces him to court. There he must try the case over again and must win it again in order to obtain the benefits from it. This the committee did not feel was fair. If as a matter of fact this system is intended to enforce compulsory arbitration, then the award should be the end of the controversy. If the employee is given an award by the Board, it should be carried out. This bill provides for just that. It would do away with judicial review except to question the jurisdiction of the Board or to show fraud in a proceeding.

GUNTHER V. SAN DIEGO RAILROAD

The Supreme Court in December of 1965 decided a case which some will argue does what we are trying to accomplish by this bill but it is far from clear. In any event, it makes the language of the present act even more contradictory than it seems to be already. If the Court meant to make all awards final, this bill would clarify the statute as well. If the

Supreme Court decision is ambiguous or faulty, this bill settles the matter.

After long deliberation your committee feels that H.R. 706 presents a fair and equitable solution.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from California for his contribution here this afternoon. I want to say that the committee has done a wonderful job in bringing this bill out to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is a remedial piece of legislation that deserves the consideration of all Members of this House.

I am happy to associate myself with the purposes and intent of the bill, as well as with the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 706, the Railway Labor Act amendments. I can think of a better name for the bill—we ought to call it the Railway Justice Act.

By any name, this bill is long overdue. We should have passed it long before now. It does not do anything that is at all complicated. It simply speeds up the machinery of justice for railway workers.

For a long time, the National Railroad Adjustment Board has had a large backlog of undecided claims filed by railway employees. I understand that employees have had to wait 10 years for a decision. And then—even when they have won their case, railway workers have to bring suit all over again if the railroad refuses to pay.

This bill will set up special boards to overcome the "railway justice lag" that has handicapped workers up until now. This procedure will make a big dent in the case backlog.

It will unclog the wheels of justice in yet another way. It will make money judgments rendered by the Board final. Judicial review will be limited to questions of jurisdiction, fraud, and so forth. This will make almost all money judgments final when they are awarded, and save railway workers from an appeal they cannot afford because they need the money quickly.

I do not believe that any of this is controversial. That is why I say it is a "Railway Justice Act." That is just what it is. I hope this legislation will receive the overwhelming approval of this House.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], and point out that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics held many hearings on this bill and received rather comprehensive testimony upon all facets of the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a bill which can be supported by the entire

membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, although my name appears on this bill I see no purpose to be served in taking the time of the House this afternoon to repeat an explanation of its provisions, which has already been given so ably to the Committee by the speakers who have preceded me.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced for a specific purpose, to provide a means for reducing or eliminating the present backlog of cases pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board, whereby claims may be expedited without unnecessary and undue delay, and to obviate continuing accumulation of backlogs of cases in the future before these boards.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for finality of decisions rendered in cases submitted to arbitration procedures under the Railway Labor Act.

Third, the bill provides for equality of treatment of both parties, by granting both the right to a court review under uniform rules of law. The bill also eliminates from the law the present one-sided right of railroads to take money awards cases to court for de novo review.

Mr. Chairman, some questions have been raised during our hearings about the constitutionality of the portion of this bill dealing with judicial review. Our committee carefully considered this question, and we were convinced the bill is constitutional. Our committee report, on pages 16 and 17 point out that the Supreme Court has upheld the principle of not permitting employees any review of denied claims, over dissents pointing out how unfair this is. Under the circumstances then, it ought to be clear that the judicial review permitted of these arbitration awards under the bill is ample under the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, it might be helpful to some Members if I were to set out in some detail a hypothetical case of the type involved in this legislation, and show how it progresses under existing procedures:

A grievance or claim whether for pay or only a principle must originate and progress under the Railway Labor Act. Its progress is slow and burdensome to the employee. Let us take the claim of a brakeman when he was not called to work in his hometown from the extra board. The contract would read, "Brakemen will be marked up on the extra board when he completes a tour of duty and will again be assigned a tour of duty when he reaches the position of top man or first out on the extra board. If he is not called in his turn after reaching the top of the list, and a man lower on the list is used he will be paid what the assignment he should have been called for pays."

As an example, let us say Mr. Blue is first out to be used on the extra list. An employee lays off on an assignment that works from 4 p.m. to midnight. Instead of calling Mr. Blue to come to work on this assignment, the crew caller calls Mr.

White, who is second on the list behind Mr. Blue, to come to work. Mr. Blue finds that he was not called to work in his turn. The assignment pays \$23 for 8 hours work. Mr. Blue then makes out a time slip for 1 day or \$23 because he was not used in his turn. The time slip is received by the personnel department of the railroad and they write Mr. Blue that his time slip has been declined for some reason. This may take some 30 days for him to find his claim has been denied. Mr. Blue then must write a grievance and present it to his lodge. If the lodge, when they meet, decides he has a valid claim, they instruct an elected officer of the lodge—local chairman—to handle Mr. Blue's claim for time lost with the superintendent of the railroad. The local chairman writes Mr. Blue's claim up to the superintendent and asks to meet him in conference. The local chairman usually handles several claims at one conference with the superintendent. Another 30 days has elapsed. The superintendent declines to allow Mr. Blue's claim. The local chairman then writes Mr. Blue's claim up with all attachments of declination and sends it to the organization's next highest officer of his organization which is the general chairman. This officer handles claims that originate in all local lodges on the entire railroad with the next highest officer of the railroad which is the general manager or his assistant. The general chairman compiles a docket of cases and requests a conference with the general manager. Possibly another 2 to 3 months have elapsed. The general manager refuses to pay the claim. The general chairman must then write a brief on the case outlining all the particulars since the claim originated and refer it to the National Railroad Adjustment Board. This may take another month because he has other duties and other claims to write up. He refers it to the National Railroad Adjustment Board to be docketed. From the time he refers it to the National Railroad Adjustment Board until the Board docketed the case may be from 6 to 9 months, so you see at the very best it has been at least 1 year since Mr. Blue first originated his claim. But this is not the end of the road for Mr. Blue. After his case is docketed with the first division of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, it must be placed on the docket at the bottom of the list. This would place Mr. Blue's case behind over 4,000 other cases.

Assume the Board sustains Mr. Blue's claim for \$23. The carrier may refuse to even now pay Mr. Blue. Under the Railway Labor Act, as it is now written, all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board are final and binding except those containing money. Mr. Blue's claim contains money. If the carrier declines to pay him, the only alternative for Mr. Blue or his organization is to sue the carrier in Federal district court and try his case before the court. He may end up before the Supreme Court of the United States 2 years later.

No doubt the general chairman had at least 25 to 30 other claims which had been denied when he received Mr. Blue's. Had he been able to have a special Board

with the carrier on the grievances, he had on hand, including Mr. Blue's, no doubt Mr. Blue would have been paid his \$23 within 1 year, which is still too long.

Mr. Chairman, the special boards that will be created under this bill will be boards created on one railroad property to handle only cases which originated on that one railroad. Each board will consist of one officer of that particular railroad and one officer of the organization, and, if necessary, a referee. Either party may have advisers with him. Each party presents his argument for the case and the referee decides it, in accordance with the terms of the contract. Both parties may agree to let a number of similar cases ride on one particular case, thus deciding several at one time.

One virtue of the special board procedure is that the cases are being handled back on the property from which they originated. Thus the carrier officer assigned to handle the board and the organization officer are more familiar with their own contract than if it were being handled by strangers to the contract.

It has been contended that this bill will make it possible to set up several thousand special boards. This will not happen, however. Such special boards will be wanted only where there is a need, and this will be on properties where a number of unsettled disputes have accumulated and one side or the other feels a special board can dispose of them faster than the NRAB.

Properties having just a few cases would not care to meet the expense of establishing a special board and, in addition, both sides on these smaller properties would not have the financial resources. Any tendency to abuse the special board provision would be offset by the necessity of paying part of the cost. There is no basis for real apprehension on this score.

In addition, analysis of the cases in the backlog now pending at the first division shows that a comparatively small number of railroads have the bulk of the cases—for example, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has about 1,500 cases in the backlog and practically all of them are from just 23 railroads having from 15 to 162 cases each. In other words, if the Trainmen wished to eliminate their backlog almost in its entirety, the 1,500 would be taken away by setting up only 23 special boards. I have been told that the same is true of the other organizations and that substantially the same railroads are involved in the bulk of their cases.

Mr. Chairman, the committee, as our chairman has said, has given serious consideration to this legislation.

Throughout the consideration of this measure many valid questions were raised with respect to various provisions contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the committee worked its will on the legislation through amendments, and today we bring to the floor a bill which I believe to be the best approach that can be made at this time toward solving a rather difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, I of course recommend the passage of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I also rise to lend my enthusiastic endorsement to H.R. 706, to amend the Railway Labor Act. This body has already been acquainted with the logjam of unsettled claims pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago.

I have heard the testimony presented during the lengthy hearings on this legislation before the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member. I was amazed that a condition of this nature could reach such staggering proportions before any relief was granted by Congress. I was further interested to learn, Mr. Chairman, that this highly unusual condition did not result from an inadequately staffed National Railroad Adjustment Board, but rather from the fact that the railroad members of the Board have in the past refused to approve a claim without first submitting the case to an impartial referee for a decision, despite the fact that the claim could be substantiated by several identical previous sustaining awards of the Board.

This is a regrettable practice, Mr. Chairman, and one that would certainly turn our courts into a burlesque, if such a principle were followed.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 706, is designed to overcome this problem by amending the Railway Labor Act so that rail carriers must agree to the establishment of a special board upon the request of a labor organization to dispose of an accumulation of cases on any one railroad property. The bill, of course, likewise permits a rail carrier to request the services of a special board, to which the labor organization must likewise agree.

This method of permitting the establishment of special boards on any one railroad property to settle an accumulation of claims is the only feasible solution to this problem, and I might point out would be less expensive for the Federal Government, as well as the parties directly involved. I believe this to be an equitable arrangement for both employer and employee, and I urge my fellow Members to act favorably on this legislation without further delay.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise not only to declare my support of H.R. 706 to amend the Railway Labor Act, but to point out that this legislation has the unanimous support of all the standard railroad labor organizations represented by the Railway Labor Executives Association, and has the endorsement of the AFL-CIO.

This proposal was thoroughly considered by the members of the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce following thorough hearings during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. After considering all facets of this legislation and following lengthy de-

liberations, the committee favorably reported this bill without a dissenting vote. I think it is worthy to note that no minority report was filed.

If I may take a moment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a short passage from the committee's report, it being House Document No. 1114:

Under the circumstances, the committee feels that a change in the existing procedures of the Board is not only warranted but is essential. Of the alternatives considered by the committee, the approach set out in the reported bill seemed to the committee the most feasible method of resolving the existing impasse.

I am willing to accept the judgment of this honorable committee, Mr. Chairman, and endorse the changes recommended in the procedure of the National Railroad Adjustment Board as contained in H.R. 706.

I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recognized that many problems existed in the methods of handling compensation cases. This bill seeks to meet the problems. We are deeply indebted to the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, who authors this bill. He worked hard and long to bring some resolution to the problem. It must be said, however, that there are some provisions of this bill which are not fully satisfactory. It, however, is clear that this bill moves in the right direction.

I received a letter from a personal friend of long standing, Mr. E. E. Berglund, representing the trainmen. This letter states very well what this bill attempts to do and I shall make this letter a part of the RECORD.

I wish further to add that this gentleman is held in high regard not only by the trainmen but as well by the railroad industry.

Mr. Berglund has always conducted himself in a fair and able manner. I insert his letter to be made a part of the RECORD:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 2, 1966.
H.R. 706, amendments to the Railway Labor Act.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: Please be referred to my letter of November 22, 1965, relative to the above-mentioned subject. H.R. 706 will amend the Railway Labor Act so as to provide that all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board will be final and binding on both parties. The law now reads the awards are final and binding except those which contain a money award.

These awards I refer to result from employee-claims for the time lost or for any other contract violation claiming pay where-in management refuses to pay the claim and the claim ends up in the Railroad Adjustment Board—Division I.

H.R. 706 further provides judicial review to either party if they can prove fraud, corruption, or that the Board went beyond its jurisdiction in the handling of the case. Many railroads refuse to pay awards made

by the Adjustment Board when money is involved. The employee then, even though his claim has been upheld by the Board, is compelled to file a lawsuit in Federal district court and have his individual case tried all over again. This has proven to be lengthy and costly to the employee.

H.R. 706 further provides that upon request from an organization or a railroad, the other must agree to the establishment of a special board on the particular property to dispose of pending cases.

I may further add that H.R. 706 was reported out of committee favorably and without dissent with the recommendation that it do pass.

I now respectfully request that you vote for and support H.R. 706 when it comes to the floor for a vote. All of the railroad men here in Minnesota are intensely interested in this piece of legislation for it is long overdue and its passage will correct some of the injustices which our people have suffered through the many years.

I sincerely ask for your favorable vote on H.R. 706.

Best personal regards.

Very sincerely,

E. E. BERGLUND,

State Legislative Representative.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the committee [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I join in expressing support for the bill, H.R. 706, as being a step in the right legislative direction.

Legislation is needed if disputes arising in the railroad industry between employees and carriers are to be resolved in a prompt and equitable manner.

As was pointed out in the committee report, under existing procedures prescribed in the Railway Labor Act, railroad employees who have grievances arising under collective bargaining agreements sometimes have to wait as long as 10 years or more before a decision is rendered on their claim, due to the great backlog of cases pending before the National Labor Adjustment Board.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, in some instances after an employee has obtained an award the carrier concerned may refuse to pay the award and the employee is forced to go to court where he is then required to try his case all over again, with the delays and uncertainties normally attendant on such litigation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 706, would correct these inequities.

Mr. Chairman, the particular question that remains in my mind is whether the limited judicial review provided in this bill will meet the test of due process of law. My hope is that additional research and consideration can be given to this part of the bill by the other body and in the conference between the two bodies before the bill becomes law.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the at-

tention of this Chamber to the basic reasons underlying our consideration of H.R. 706 to amend the Railway Labor Act. As you know, lengthy hearings were held on this legislation before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have taken the opportunity to review these hearings, which were held during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, and I feel the record supports the passage of this remedial legislation. As all of us know, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shares this view, since it reported this bill without a single dissenting vote on October 1, 1965, and found no evidence lacking to even write a minority report. Many of you, I know, have interested yourselves in House Report No. 1114 and have noted the recommendations of this illustrious committee.

Congress has historically been cognizant of the needs of the railroad industry and its employees, and it has not hesitated to act when the situation called for action. We are here treating with an industry that runs 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and every day in the year. Our recent bout with the blizzard of 1966 reminds us that in railroading severe weather is simply a part of the modus operandi, and the same demands and the same performance are expected in daylight or darkness, on sunny days and in blizzards.

As in any other industry, Mr. Chairman, railroad employees have grievances, or shall we term them "minor disputes" over the interpretation of their working agreements. But unlike most industries, an aggrieved railroad employee seldom is accorded a prompt handling of his grievance. The hearings before the subcommittee revealed that some railroad employees must wait between 7 and 10 years before obtaining a decision from the National Railroad Adjustment Board. That seems like an incredible situation, Mr. Chairman, but one can easily comprehend the hopelessness of the Board's performance when we note, as was brought out in testimony at the time of the hearings, that the backlog before just the first division is well over 4,000 cases. Some statisticians have hazarded a guess that at the present snail-like pace the Board would have no trouble in cleaning up this docket of 4,000 cases if given the next 32 years to do so—with one proviso, Mr. Chairman—that no new cases be added.

Congress never envisaged the development of a situation of this nature, Mr. Chairman, when it passed legislation in 1934 to set up the National Railroad Adjustment Board. And it is our moral duty to right this condition. H.R. 706 has as one of its provisions permission to establish, upon the request of either railroad management or the railroad employees, special boards of adjustment to dispose of an accumulation of grievances on any single railroad carrier. If either party requests the services of a special board, the other must agree.

I think this is a key provision, Mr. Chairman, since the testimony at the time of the hearings brought out the fact that while one of the larger railroad labor organizations was agreeable to dis-

posing of some 1,700 cases during a 12-year period, representatives of the railroad industry responded to the extent of agreeing to only 23 claims during the same 12-year period. In fact, the testimony further revealed the unbelievable fact that two carrier members never agreed to allow a claim during that period. This type of condition is arbitrary, Mr. Chairman, in an area where there must be some give and take.

H.R. 706 will be a giant step in the right direction, Mr. Chairman. It will not change the working habits of members of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, but it will open a door for employees when relief is needed by making it possible to obtain the services of a special board. Under the functioning of a special board, cases are handled expeditiously and the decisions are final and binding, thereby preventing any lengthy appeal process.

In discussing the grievance procedure and the operation of the National Railroad Adjustment Board with some of my constituents who are railroad employees, I was dismayed to learn the involvement and true hardship in claims before the Board pertaining to reinstatement. This type of case which involves an employee's livelihood may be delayed at the Board for as much as 2 years, or longer, while the employee walks the streets or draws his unemployment compensation.

A serious inequity can and often does result from this type of condition, Mr. Chairman. Under the present setup of the Board, all awards of the Board are final and binding except those involving money—that is, a reinstatement case. If the Board should decide against the employee in such a case, he has had it, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no right of appeal under the present law. But this same finality in no way applies to the rail carrier if the employee wins his case before the Board. The carrier can, and often does refuse to pay a money award, since the present law permits this choice, and if the beleaguered railroad employee is still interested in pursuing his case, he must file a lawsuit in a Federal district court and have his case tried all over again. This is an expensive procedure for the average railroad employee, Mr. Chairman, since at this point in his hard luck he certainly has no bagfull of cash to process a suit through the courts. It is my understanding that a case of this type can go as far as the Supreme Court of the United States before it is finally decided. I point out that all of this production is over what begins as a minor dispute.

The legislation now before us for consideration and action will eliminate this arbitrary provision of law by making all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board final and binding, including the money awards I have just been speaking about. Passage of the bill will simply make both sides equal under the law, whereas the act, as it now stands, gives an advantage and a privilege to one side which are denied to the other.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the urgent need for the remedies provided in H.R. 706. I learned from my constituents that often-

times an employee is either retired or deceased when the National Railroad Adjustment Board finally gets around to handling his claim. I think even in the Dark Ages this practice would not be tolerated, Mr. Chairman, and certainly it is not 20th-century operation. I respectfully urge my colleagues to adopt this bill.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may require to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 706 is designed to solve the substantial problem of painfully slow adjudication of grievances under the Railway Labor Act, by eliminating the large backlog of undecided claims of railroad employees pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago, and to provide the opportunity for judicial review of awards of this Board equally to both employees and employers.

This will be accomplished by the establishment, upon the request of a representative of management or labor, of special boards for the adjudication of grievances arising under collective bargaining agreements in the railroad industry. Judicial review of orders of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and of boards established under this legislation, would be limited to the determination of questions traditionally involved in arbitration legislation, that is, whether the tribunal had jurisdiction of the subject, whether there was compliance with the statutory requirements, and whether there was fraud or corruption on the part of a member of the tribunal.

We can see the need for this legislation by merely observing the situation presently existing before Division I of the National Railroad Adjustment Board. There are pending at the Board 4,000 unsettled cases involving claims of railroad employees, and at the Board's present rate of handling cases it will take 32 years to dispose of the present backlog without the addition of a single case. In some cases, railroad employees have had to wait as long as 10 years before their cases are considered. The submission of almost all claims to referees has created long delays in the handling of individual cases. If special boards could be agreed to, this backlog could then be disposed of in a reasonably short time.

This legislation is designed to provide the answer to this problem by compelling agreement upon request by either party to the establishment of a special board to dispose of a docket of cases on the carrier's property.

It is worth noting that under the present system, many employees have either been retired or deceased when their cases were finally considered. This question before us then is not one of in-

creasing or decreasing the rights of either the railroad employees or the carriers, but merely allowing those rights to be determined within a reasonable period of time. The fault or delay of the past is not attributable to any one agency or group, but the present system simply has not worked as it should have—or was intended. All the Congress asks to do now is speed up these litigations so that working people can be given proper hearings, time to have their cases considered, and decisions handed down in a reasonable time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the committee [Mr. MACKAY].

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I rise in support of H.R. 706 to amend the Railway Labor Act primarily because this legislation is long overdue to correct an incredible situation existing at the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the National Railroad Adjustment Board was established by an act of Congress in 1934 under the Railway Labor Act to arbitrate unsettled employee grievances in the railroad industry. I shudder to think of the reaction Members of Congress at that time would have had if they, through an act of clairvoyance, could have foreseen the utter shambles that has slowed the Board's decisionmaking machinery to an almost nonexistent pace.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to direct your attention to a fact that was developed in hearings on this legislation before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I refer to the unbelievable backlog of unsettled cases pending before Division I of the National Railroad Adjustment Board. That Division decides cases of all on-train railroad employees. You will be shocked to learn that at the present time there are over 4,000 of these cases awaiting action by Division I of the Board—I repeat, Mr. Chairman—4,000.

A study of the past performance of Division I reveals that its present rate of production would require 32 years of operation to clear the docket of the 4,000 pending cases, provided no other cases are added. This is a ludicrous situation, Mr. Chairman, and I feel imposes a true injustice on those railroad employees who patiently await a verdict from the Board on their unsettled claims.

I have received reports from railroad employees in my district that in some instances they have been compelled to wait as long as 10 or 11 years before their case is considered by the Board. If I might add an unpleasant footnote, I would like to point out that some of these employees have retired and others are deceased by the time their claims receive adjudication. Here we see a specific illustration of the maxim: "Justice delayed is justice denied."

Mr. Chairman, this is a condition that begs for correction, and I urge my fellow Members to act favorably on H.R. 706, which will, through an act of simple justice, remove the brakes from the Board's machinery.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to highly commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS], and all other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the very thorough study and the excellent bill that they have reported for consideration by the Members of the House this afternoon. I enthusiastically support the provisions of H.R. 706 and express the hope that my colleagues will unanimously pass this measure.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 706, the Railway Labor Act amendments. This proposed legislation will eliminate the large backlog of railroad employee claims pending before the National Adjustment Board by reason of the establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of management to resolve disputes which would otherwise be referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Boards. All awards of these special boards will be final with judicial review limited to questions traditionally involved in arbitration legislation such as jurisdiction of the subject matter, compliance with statutory requirements and whether a fraud was perpetrated by a member of the tribunal.

Under present law, with the huge number of cases docketed, and pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board an employee of one of the operating brotherhoods who has a grievance arising out of an alleged violation of a collective bargaining agreement or work rule, and who files a claim based upon this grievance, will, if his claim is rejected by management, sometimes have to wait as long as 10 years before receiving a decision on his grievance. Also, Mr. Chairman, in many instances, after an employee has been rendered an award, management refuses to pay thus forcing the employee to go to court where he must try his case again and withstand the normal delays of litigation.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the machinery established under H.R. 706 can work more expeditiously to handle the backlog of claims and I believe that this is a sound solution to a serious problem throughout the railroad industry.

This legislation is long overdue and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my support to H.R. 706, amendments to the Railway Labor Act. Like my colleagues, I feel that these amendments are just and necessary to clarify arbitration procedures between employers and employees within the railroad industry through the establishment of special adjustment boards at the request of either management or labor. Thus, Mr. Chairman, by putting the two on an equal footing in the arbitration of minor disputes, we not only serve to untangle the present complications of the Railway Labor Act, but uphold the highest traditions of labor-management arbitration by seeking just

solutions to the equal benefit of both parties.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 706, titled "Railway Labor Act Amendments."

The bill would make changes in the Railway Labor Act of 1934. H.R. 706 has two general purposes:

First. To eliminate the large backlog of undecided claims of railway employees pending before the National Railway Adjustment Board.

Second. To provide equal opportunity for judicial review of awards of the National Railway Adjustment Board to employees and employers.

The backlog of undecided claims frequently has grown from a procedure under the act of 1934 that calls for both the carrier and the employee to agree on the establishment of special boards of adjustment to settle cases.

The present bill, H.R. 706, would change this so that either management or labor may demand at any time the establishment of a special board on the properties of the carrier affected.

Also, under the 1934 act, in cases where the carrier refuses to pay an award made to the employee by the Adjustment Board, the employee is forced to go to court and try his case again. There is no means specified in the act, other than resort to the courts, whereby any award of the Board to the employee may be enforced. If the employee fails to receive an award in his favor, there is no means by which judicial review may be obtained.

The present bill would change this so that all awards of the National Railway Adjustment Board would be final and binding on both parties. Judicial review is provided either party if they can prove fraud, corruption, or that the Board went beyond its jurisdiction in handling the case.

To indicate the seriousness of the backlog of cases under existing procedures of the Railway Labor Act, I would like to point out to my colleagues there have been cases where railroad employees with grievances sometimes have waited as long as 10 years before a decision is made on their claims.

I believe the proposed bill will help avoid these delays. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the National Railroad Adjustment Board was established by Congress in 1934, under the Railway Labor Act, to arbitrate minor disputes—unadjusted employee grievances—in the industry, but for some years now, it has been something less than effective in carrying out the mandate of the Congress.

Railroad employees are forced at times to wait as long as 10 or 11 years to get a decision on pending claims. A huge backlog of cases prevents speedy and equitable solution of the claims.

H.R. 706, if enacted, would make possible the settlement of claims in a reasonable time. It is fair to both employer and employee. It should be passed.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I must leave the floor prior to the vote on H.R. 706 to amend the Railway Labor Act, I wish to announce to my colleagues and

others interested in this legislation that I am in favor of it. Had I been present, I would have voted for it. Due to the lack of opposition to its passage, I was unable to obtain a pair vote. I regret that speaking commitments in Ohio made prior to the scheduling of this bill for consideration necessitate my absence at this time.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, although it is not possible for me to be present and vote for H.R. 706, I do want to go on record in support of this much needed legislation. Because of the tremendous number of cases pending before the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the enactment of this legislation is imperative to clear the docket. I want to commend the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the attention it gave to this bill.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add my support for these much needed amendments to the Railway Labor Act of 1934. The amendments will make possible much more expeditious settlement of labor-management disputes in the industry and so correct serious and longstanding problems of delay. Further the amendments will make all settlements final except where evidence of fraud or jurisdictional disputes exist. This is only fair to both sides. For these reasons I join those who support this bill.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong support of H.R. 706, Railway Labor Act amendment, which, in my opinion, is a very meritorious and badly needed piece of legislation.

It is with extreme regret that circumstances beyond my control are such that I will be unable to be present at the time a vote is taken on this matter. Were it possible for me to be here I would certainly vote for this legislation, and I do urge all my colleagues to wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 706 to amend the Railway Labor Act. The unfairness of the present system of handling employees' claims at the National Railroad Adjustment Board disturbs me.

I am aware, of course, Mr. Chairman, of the backlog of cases that would require decades to adjudicate. But there is another aspect of the present operation that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that also accounts for the delay in handling these cases to a conclusion—and that is the fact that all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board are final and binding except those involving money.

Under the present arrangement a railroad carrier can refuse to abide by an award of the Board if it involves the payment of money. Ironically if an employee's case in a claim involving money is denied by the Board, the employee has no further recourse; he must accept the denial. But a railroad carrier has the right to refuse to pay a money award, thereby forcing the employee, if he is still interested, to file a lawsuit in a Federal district court and have his case tried all over again. This is a burdensome procedure for the average railroad employee, Mr. Chairman, since he usually

does not have the financial wherewithal to process a lawsuit. If he does choose to incur this expense, he is faced with the additional delay of a court trying the case again from the beginning.

And this may not be the end of the line yet, Mr. Chairman. A case of this nature can possibly go as far as the Supreme Court of the United States before it is finally decided. This involves unnecessary expense and needless delay, Mr. Chairman, for a type of case that is initially filed with the National Railroad Adjustment Board as a minor dispute over an employee's grievance on one rail carrier.

I stand in support of H.R. 706 since it will eliminate this oddity in the present setup by making all awards of the Board final and binding, including the money awards.

Mr. Chairman, I submit there is no other just alternative to this proposal, and I urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 706. I seriously regret that Congress has not taken the steps long ago to correct the gross inequities existing under the present Railway Labor Act.

H.R. 706 would end some gross injustices in the present handling of employee grievances in the railroad industry—injustices that have caused widespread resentment among the employees.

The Railway Labor Act provides that when minor disputes—grievances—cannot be settled between railway labor and management, they shall be referred for settlement to the National Railroad Adjustment Board. Since the courts have ruled that employees may not strike over these cases, this has become a form of compulsory arbitration.

In recent years, the backlog of cases pending before the NRAB—especially its first division, covering operating employees—has risen to alarming heights. As the Commerce Committee's report—Report No. 1114—points out:

Under existing procedures, railroad employees who have grievances sometimes have to wait as long as 10 years or more before a decision is rendered on their claim.

The NRAB's first division alone now has over 4,000 cases pending before it; in 1964 that division decided 128 cases. The committee found that the third division "has fallen into the same shoddy condition and is improving only slowly."

To end this obviously unfair situation, H.R. 706 provides that special boards of adjustment may be created to clean up the backlog of grievance cases between a union and a railroad whenever either side so requests. Such special boards can be created now only when both sides agree to it. Some railroads and unions have agreed to such boards, with very beneficial results. Other railroads have refused, and those are the railroads with the huge backlog of employee grievance cases pending before the NRAB. The Commerce Committee concluded it is essential to change the present impasse and that H.R. 706's approach is the most feasible method.

Second, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 706 would end a grossly unjust provision in exist-

ing law, which says that NRAB decisions shall be final and binding "except insofar as they shall contain a money award." This means that if the employee wins his case before the NRAB, the railroad can—frequently does—obtain judicial review by refusing to pay the monetary award. The employee then has to bring an enforcement suit in Federal court where it is necessary for the entire case to be tried again in a trial de novo. The employee may—and frequently does—find it necessary to appeal the lower court decision to the court of appeals and then to the Supreme Court.

On the other hand, if the employee receives an adverse award from the NRAB, he has no appeal. Disposition of his claim is final and binding.

H.R. 706 would end this by making all NRAB and special board decisions final and binding, except if the arbitrators fail to comply with the act or fail to confine their awards to their scope of authority, or in case of fraud or corruption. Judicial review thus would be available to employers and employees alike, but on the limited basis traditionally applicable to awards of arbitration tribunals as provided in section 9 of the Railway Labor Act. Based on Supreme Court decisions, the committee concluded that this procedure is fully constitutional.

On this subject the committee report states:

The one-sidedness of existing law is extremely unfair to employees. Since the NRAB is an arbitration tribunal, in the committee's opinion all of the awards rendered by the Board should be complied with.

Mr. Chairman, under existing procedures prescribed in the Railway Labor Act, railroad employees who have grievances sometimes have to wait as long as 10 years or more before a decision is rendered on their claim. In addition, in some instances, after an employee has obtained an award, the carrier concerned refuses to pay the award, and the employee is forced to go to court where he is then required to try his case all over again, with the delays and uncertainties normally attendant on litigation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not need to point out to my colleagues what a grave injustice is done our railroad workers as a result of these actions. They deserve better treatment and it is a shame this deplorable situation exists. This Congress can remedy this injustice by enacting this bill H.R. 706 into law. I hope my colleagues will join me and support this legislation wholeheartedly as I do.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to act favorably on H.R. 706 to amend the Railway Labor Act.

This legislation is designed to eliminate the huge backlog of undecided employee grievance claims now pending at the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago. I was distressed to learn from reading the hearings held during the 1st session of the 89th Congress and the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the jam at the Board has reached thousands of cases. I note particularly that division 1, which handles the claims of all

on-train railroad employees, is approximately 4,000 behind in its work. The figures contained in the committee's report indicate that at the present rate of deciding claims, it would require more than 30 years of the Board's time to clear up this backlog, provided no additional cases were submitted.

Mr. Chairman, we often say that "the wheels of the gods grind slowly but they grind exceedingly fine"—but as far as the National Railroad Adjustment Board is concerned, they have come to a halt. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the enactment of H.R. 706 is an act of simple justice to correct a situation which has been permitted to grow too bad for too long. The provision in this legislation for the establishment of special boards of adjustment, upon the request of either management or labor, is a fair and sensible way of attacking this problem, and I would like to urge my colleagues to enact this worthy item of legislation without delay.

I am pleased to lend my support to the unanimous views of the committee as set forth in Report No. 1114.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of these amendments to the Railway Labor Act, in the hope that the grave inequities that have been allowed to continue over the years since 1935, will finally be corrected by this legislation.

Like many of my colleagues, I am disturbed about the present functioning and pace of the National Railroad Adjustment Board—especially its first and third divisions.

I say this advisedly. As of March 1965 the first division, which has never been current in its work since its establishment in 1935, had a backlog of cases which would take them 7½ years to complete at their rate of the past 15 years. The third division had a backlog of 3½ years of work.

The fault is in how the present system works. Originally it was supposed that settlement of grievances arising under collective-bargaining agreements in the railway industry could be settled by two reasonable men, one representing management, one representing labor. In the few cases where they might fail, the Railway Labor Act provided for the appointment of a neutral third person to serve as a referee.

It was also assumed that, in general, when a decision was made it would be accepted by both parties. In a word, it was the underlying assumption that a desire existed on the sides of both labor and management to arrive at a settlement of their disputes like reasonable men.

The results have been far different. Instead of a machinery for settlement of grievances the Adjustment Board has become a means of channeling grievance cases into an indefinite limbo of delay, legal confusion, and a refusal to assume responsibility.

H.R. 706, which has been ably described by others, would attempt to correct some of these faults. It would speed up and render more certain the decision of complaints arising under labor-management agreements on railroads. It would make such settlements more equitable and less

discriminatory. I am hopeful that substantial good will come from H.R. 706. To the extent that correction of demonstrated faults in the law can correct the problems of our railroad labor-management relations, I think we will be acting today to accomplish that end.

Beyond that, matters must revert to labor and management. If, instead of the present desire to use the settlement machinery of the Railway Labor Act as a means of stultifying genuine grievance settlement, by our act here today we awaken in railway labor and railway management the desire for legitimate use of the means to labor peace and mutually responsive grievance settlement, I shall be greatly pleased.

When the Railway Labor Act was passed in 1926 it came at a time after a series of disastrous strikes and serious disagreements had shaken both labor and management into a realization that something has to be done. At that time the two sides got together and worked out a joint proposal which both supported before the Congress and which formed the basis for our present Railway Labor Act. It is my sincere hope that responsible men on both sides in the industry will again attempt to make the machinery we are trying to repair here today work anew.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 706 would end some gross injustices in the present handling of employee grievances in the railroad industry—injustices that have caused widespread resentment among the employees.

The National Railroad Adjustment Board was established by Congress in 1934, under the Railway Labor Act, to arbitrate "minor disputes"—unadjusted employee grievances—in this industry, but for the past 15 years the NRAB has failed miserably to function as it should.

The NRAB is divided into four divisions. The first division handles all claims cases of the "operating" employees. Three other divisions handle cases involving the "nonoperating" employees. As an example of the delaying tactics and inaction of the NRAB, there are at the present time over 4,000 cases pending before the first division of the Board. If there were no further cases sent to the first division as of this date, and using as a yardstick the production rate of the division for the past 3 years, it would take 32 years to clear the present docket.

Railroad employees now wait as long as 10 to 11 years to get a decision on their claims pending, by which time many of them are either retired or deceased. Railroad employees are certainly entitled to more equitable treatment than is now being afforded them.

One of the main reasons for this huge backlog of cases is the refusal of management to accept awards or precedent in subsequent similar cases unless they tend to deny a given claim. The other basic cause for the slowdown and resultant backlog is the refusal of the carrier members of the Board to decide a case without a referee, unless the labor members will agree to a denial or dismissal of the claim. Preparing briefs and oral argument before a referee takes

many days and even weeks in many cases, hence the reason for the carrier members refusing to decide cases without a referee. The railroad brotherhoods have tried for years to reach an understanding with the executives of the Nation's railroads which would have taken care of this matter; however, their efforts have been futile.

The result is to deny the employees many thousands of dollars due them for as long as 10 to 11 years, while the carrier has the use of this money without interest or penalty of any kind. Decisions relating to basic principles in the working agreements with the carriers are also withheld by delaying decisions of claims of contract violations.

H.R. 706 is the solution to this problem. It provides that upon request from an organization or a carrier the other must agree to the establishment of a "special board" on that particular property to dispose of pending cases. In dealing with the economic factor, the fact is that the cost of disposing of cases before a "special board" would be much less for the carrier, the organization, and the Federal Government.

There is at present provision in the Railway Labor Act for the establishment of "special boards of adjustment" on individual railroads to dispose of dockets or cases upon agreement by both parties. Of course, those railroads that are responsible for the huge backlog of cases will not agree to "special boards." A number of railroad carriers will at the present time agree to such "special boards." There is no backlog of cases on these railroads, neither do they have a backlog pending at the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

H.R. 706 is equitable to both the employees and the carriers. It makes possible the settlement of claims in a reasonable time, without waiting from 8 to 11 years for the same settlement. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Second, the Railway Labor Act now provides that "all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board are final and binding except insofar as they shall contain a money award." The serious adverse effect of this provision on the employees is that all awards which deny a worker's claim for settlement of a grievance are final and binding, while those awards which sustain his claim when money is involved are not final and binding on the employer. Some railroad managements in recent years have adopted a policy of refusing to pay awards made by the Adjustment Board when money is involved. The only recourse open to the employee, even though his claim has been upheld by the Board, is to file a law suit in Federal district court and have his case tried all over again. This procedure may go clear to the Supreme Court of the United States. This is a gross inequity to the employees.

Railroad employees have suffered a great financial loss through the injustice of railroad management's refusing to pay claims which the National Railroad Adjustment Board has sustained, thereby finding it necessary to go through all the

courts to the U.S. Supreme Court in order to try to collect a claim which has already been decided in their favor.

H.R. 706 will erase this gross injustice. H.R. 706 simply provides that all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board will be final and binding (including those containing money) on both parties. It provides judicial review to either party if they can prove fraud, corruption, or that the Board went beyond its jurisdiction in the handling of the case. These are the tests traditionally applicable to awards of arbitration tribunals established pursuant to section 9 of the Railway Labor Act. This bill has had full and complete hearings before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. After amendment, it was reported to the full committee without dissent and the full committee has now reported the bill out favorably without dissent. There was no minority report filed on the bill. The committee reported that:

Under the circumstances, the committee feels that a change in the existing procedures of the Board is not only warranted but is essential. Of the alternatives considered by the committee, the approach set out in the reported bill seemed to the committee the most feasible method of resolving the existing impasse.

The bill is strongly supported by the 22 organizations represented by Railway Labor Executives Association and by the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for this bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute amendment to the bill reported by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 706

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3, Second, of the Railway Labor Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"If written request is made upon any individual carrier by the representative of any craft or class of employees of such carrier for the establishment of a special board of adjustment to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the Adjustment Board, or any dispute which has been pending before the Adjustment Board for 12 months from the date the dispute (claim) is received by the Board, or if any carrier makes such a request upon any such representative, the carrier or the representative upon whom such request is made shall join in an agreement establishing such a board within thirty days from the date such request is made. The cases which may be considered by such board shall be defined in the agreement establishing it. Such board shall consist of one person designated by the carrier and one person designated by the representative of the employees. If such carrier or such representative fails to agree upon the establishment of such a board as provided herein, or to exercise its rights to designate a member of the board, the carrier or representative making the request for the establishment of the special board may request the Mediation Board to designate a member of the special board on

behalf of the carrier or representative upon whom such request was made. Upon receipt of a request for such designation the Mediation Board shall promptly make such designation and shall select an individual associated in interest with the carrier or representative he is to represent, who, with the member appointed by the carrier or representative requesting the establishment of the special board, shall constitute the board. Each member of the board shall be compensated by the party he is to represent. The members of the board so designated shall determine all matters not previously agreed upon by the carrier and the representative of the employees with respect to the establishment and jurisdiction of the board. If they are unable to agree such matters shall be determined by a neutral member of the board selected or appointed and compensated in the same manner as is hereinafter provided with respect to situations where the members of the board are unable to agree upon an award. Such neutral member shall cease to be a member of the board when he has determined such matters. If with respect to any dispute or group of disputes the members of the board designated by the carrier and the representative are unable to agree upon an award disposing of the dispute or group of disputes they shall by mutual agreement select a neutral person to be a member of the board for the consideration and disposition of such dispute or group of disputes. In the event the members of the board designated by the parties are unable, within ten days after their failure to agree upon an award, to agree upon the selection of such neutral person, either member of the board may request the Mediation Board to appoint such neutral person and upon receipt of such request the Mediation Board shall promptly make such appointment. The neutral person so selected or appointed shall be compensated and reimbursed for expenses by the Mediation Board. Any two members of the board shall be competent to render an award. Such awards shall be final and binding upon both parties to the dispute and if in favor of the petitioner, shall direct the other party to comply therewith on or before the day named. Compliance with such awards shall be enforceable by proceedings in the United States district courts in the same manner and subject to the same provisions that apply to proceedings for enforcement of compliance with awards of the Adjustment Board."

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 3, First, (m), of the Railway Labor Act is amended by striking out "except insofar as they shall contain a money award".

(b) Section 3, First, (o), of the Railway Labor Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the event any division determines that an award favorable to the petitioner should not be made in any dispute referred to it, the division shall make an order to the petitioner stating such determination."

(c) The second sentence of section 3, First, (p), of such Act is amended by striking out "shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be conclusive on the parties".

(d) The last sentence of section 3, First, (p), of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided, however, That such order may not be set aside except for failure of the division to comply with the requirements of this Act, for failure of the order to conform, or confine itself, to matters within the scope of the division's jurisdiction, or for fraud or corruption by a member of the division making the order".

(e) Section 3, First, of such Act is further amended by redesignating paragraphs (q) through (w) thereof as paragraphs (r) through (x), respectively, and by inserting

after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) If any employee or group of employees, or any carrier, is aggrieved by the failure of any division of the Adjustment Board to make an award in a dispute referred to it, or is aggrieved by any of the terms of an award or by the failure of the division to include certain terms in such award, then such employee or group of employees or carrier may file in any United States district court in which a petition under paragraph (p) could be filed, a petition for review of the division's order. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Adjustment Board. The Adjustment Board shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which it based its action. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the order of the division or to set it aside, in whole or in part, or it may remand the proceeding to the division for such further action as it may direct. On such review, the findings and order of the division shall be conclusive on the parties, except that the order of the division may be set aside, in whole or in part, or remanded to the division, for failure of the division to comply with the requirements of this Act, for failure of the order to conform, or confine itself, to matters within the scope of the division's jurisdiction, or for fraud or corruption by a member of the division making the order. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review as provided in sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28, United States Code."

Mr. YOUNGER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with, and that the substitute amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. HANNA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 706) to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the

point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 380, nays 0, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—380

Abbt	Donohue	Hutchinson
Abernethy	Dorn	Ichord
Adair	Dow	Irwin
Adams	Downing	Jacobs
Addabbo	Dulski	Jarman
Albert	Duncan, Ore.	Jennings
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan, Tenn.	Joelson
Anderson,	Dwyer	Johnson, Calif.
Tenn.	Dyal	Johnson, Okla.
Andrews,	Edmondson	Johnson, Pa.
George W.	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Andrews,	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Ala.
Glenn	Edwards, La.	Jones, Mo.
Annunzio	Erlenborn	Karsten
Arends	Evans, Colo.	Karth
Ashley	Everett	Kastenmeter
Ashmore	Ewins, Tenn.	Kee
Aspinall	Fallon	Keith
Bandstra	Farbstein	Kelly
Baring	Farnsley	Keogh
Barrett	Farnum	King, N.Y.
Bates	Fascell	King, Utah
Beckworth	Feighan	Kirwan
Belcher	Findley	Kluczynski
Bell	Fino	Kornegay
Bennett	Fisher	Krebs
Betts	Flood	Kunkel
Bingham	Flynt	Landrum
Blatnik	Fogarty	Langen
Boland	Foley	Latta
Bolling	Ford,	Lennon
Bolton	William D.	Lipscomb
Brademas	Fountain	Long, La.
Brock	Fraser	Long, Md.
Brooks	Frelinghuysen	Love
Brown, Calif.	Friedel	McCarthy
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton, Pa.	McClary
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Tenn.	McCulloch
Buchanan	Gallagher	McDade
Burke	Garmatz	McDowell
Burleson	Gathings	McFall
Burton, Calif.	Gettys	McGrath
Burton, Utah	Gilbert	McMillan
Byrne, Pa.	Gilligan	McVicker
Byrnes, Wis.	Gonzalez	Macdonald
Cabell	Goodell	MacGregor
Callan	Grabowski	Machen
Cameron	Gray	Mackay
Carey	Green, Ore.	Mackie
Carter	Green, Pa.	Madden
Casey	Greigg	Mahton
Cederberg	Grider	Mailliard
Chamberlain	Griffin	Marsh
Chelf	Griffiths	Martin, Ala.
Clancy	Gross	Mathias
Clark	Grover	May
Clausen,	Gubser	Meeds
Don H.	Gurney	Michel
Clawson, Del.	Hagan, Ga.	Miller
Cleveland	Hagen, Calif.	Mills
Clevenger	Haley	Minish
Cohelan	Hall	Mink
Collier	Halleck	Minshall
Colmer	Halpern	Moeller
Conable	Hamilton	Monagan
Conte	Hanley	Moore
Conyers	Hanna	Moorhead
Cooley	Hansen, Iowa	Morgan
Corbett	Hansen, Wash.	Morris
Corman	Hardy	Morrison
Craley	Harsha	Morse
Cramer	Harvey, Mich.	Morton
Culver	Hathaway	Mosher
Cunningham	Hawkins	Moss
Curtin	Hays	Multer
Curtis	Hébert	Murphy, Ill.
Daddario	Hechler	Murphy, N.Y.
Dague	Helstoski	Natcher
Daniels	Henderson	Nedzi
Davis, Ga.	Herlong	Nelsen
Davis, Wis.	Hicks	O'Brien
de la Garza	Hollfield	O'Hara, Ill.
Delaney	Holland	O'Hara, Mich.
Dent	Horton	O'Konski
Denton	Hosmer	Olsen, Mont.
Devine	Howard	Olson, Minn.
Dickinson	Hull	O'Neal, Ga.
Diggs	Hungate	O'Neill, Mass.
Dingell	Huot	Ottinger

Patman	Rostenkowski	Tenzer
Patten	Roybal	Thompson, N.J.
Pepper	Rumsfeld	Thompson, Tex.
Perkins	Ryan	Todd
Philbin	Satterfield	Trimble
Pickle	St Germain	Tuck
Fike	St. Onge	Tunney
Pirnie	Saylor	Tupper
Poage	Scheuer	Tuten
Poff	Schisler	Udall
Pool	Schmidhauser	Ullman
Price	Schneebeli	Utt
Pucinski	Schweiker	Van Deerlin
Purcell	Secrest	Vanik
Qule	Selden	Vigorito
Quillen	Senner	Vivian
Race	ShIPLEY	Waggonner
Randall	Shriver	Walker, Miss.
Redlin	Sickles	Walker, N. Mex.
Rees	Sikes	Watkins
Reid, Ill.	Sisk	Watson
Reid, N.Y.	Slack	Weltner
Reifel	Smith, Calif.	Whalley
Reinecke	Smith, Iowa	White, Idaho
Resnick	Smith, N.Y.	White, Tex.
Reuss	Smith, Va.	Whitener
Rhodes, Pa.	Stafford	Whitten
Rivers, S.C.	Staggers	Widnall
Rivers, Alaska	Stalbaum	Williams
Roberts	Stanton	Wilson,
Robison	Steed	Charles H.
Rodino	Stephens	Wolf
Rogers, Colo.	Stratton	Wright
Rogers, Fla.	Stubblefield	Wyatt
Rogers, Tex.	Sullivan	Wydler
Ronan	Sweeney	Yates
Roncallo	Talcott	Young
Rooney, N.Y.	Taylor	Younger
Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Calif.	Zablocki
Rosenthal	Teague, Tex.	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—51

Andrews,	Dowdy	Nix
N. Dak.	Ellsworth	Passman
Ashbrook	Ford, Gerald R.	Pelly
Ayres	Fuqua	Powell
Baldwin	Gialmo	Rhodes, Ariz.
Battin	Gibbons	Roudebush
Berry	Hansen, Idaho	Roush
Boggs	Harvey, Ind.	Scott
Bow	King, Calif.	Skubitz
Bray	Laird	Springer
Broomfield	Leggett	Thomas
Brown, Ohio	McEwen	Thomson, Wis.
Cahill	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Callaway	Martin, Nebr.	Watts
Celler	Matsumaga	Willis
Dawson	Matthews	Wilson, Bob
Derwinski	Mize	
Dole	Murray	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. King of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Matsumaga with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Thomas with Mr. Gerald Ford.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. Murray with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Roush with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Battin.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Ellsworth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended to read: "An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or

of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request and include in the request consent to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BROADER CONCERN AND A LIVELIER UNDERSTANDING NEEDED FOR THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this Hall has heard before the plea of this Representative for a broader concern and a livelier understanding for the Pacific community. We have great reason to be proud of the great creative effort that our country put forth for the constructive program of the Atlantic community. Out of those efforts, and with the enthusiastic cooperation of the countries affected, Western Europe had one of the most dramatic postwar recoveries noted in the annals of history.

Out of that recovery increased trade and intercourse between America and Europe contributed mightily to our own vitality and economic well-being. Out of the improvements, advancement, and growth in the countries of the Atlantic community came also a substantial and critical contribution to the security of the free world. Out of economic development came political stability upon which security ultimately rests.

As we look to the other ocean America shares with neighbors, we see another great potential for partnership in peaceful progress. The Pacific, by the new speed in the technological advance of jet air travel, has become indeed a neighborhood. But we must work together to make it a community. A community comes from an awareness of interdependency, from the presence of interwoven responsibilities. In a community there is mutuality. Recognition of mutual concerns sparks mutual efforts on behalf of programs of mutual benefit.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what the Asian Bank is doing and will do in East Asia is to set a pattern of community action. Here is an institu-

tion which pools the neighborhood resources. Here is a tool which fashions a community mentality. A way of thinking which recognizes problems does not stop at arbitrary national boundaries.

In the Asian Development Bank we see the first institution in which all of the elements of the community are active and where such elements are brought together in a practical and dynamic program. The fruits of the effort may well go far beyond the actual accomplishments of the Bank itself. The Bank is a first step, an important first step, in the process of community building. We will need additional steps; other institutions which will pool strength and attack problems. It is then we will see in the Pacific Community the emerging, satisfying story of economic improvement, welfare betterment, increasing standards of living and increasing stability of political structures. The people and countries of the Pacific will then be as important in the partnership for peace and security as have been the peoples and nations of the Atlantic Community. We strongly urge and support the U.S. participation. By our action here today, my colleagues, we show the world that we not only respond to fight injustice; we move as readily to build justice. Our policy is not just to harass and oppose the oppressor; we stand ready to help and encourage the oppressed. We are not only against aggression; we are for pooling resources, building institutions, and cooperating with skills so that capabilities are expanded and opportunities enlarged.

THE ADOPTION OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a revised version of a bill entitled the "Adoption Opportunity Act." This legislation would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a tax deduction for social agency, legal, and other related expenses incurred in the adoption of a child.

The Adoption Opportunity Act of 1966 amends, improves, and supersedes similar legislation which I introduced in 1965. The new proposal incorporates changes which were suggested in the numerous letters which I have received from all over the Nation, basically approving of the legislation.

Specifically, the new bill incorporates these strengthening amendments:

First, it makes clear that social and adoption agency fees would be covered by the bill and therefore would be deductible in the adoption of a child. While this was the intent of the first proposal, it was not so clearly stated as it might have been.

Second, the bill makes clear that overseas adoptions and adoptions in the District of Columbia would be covered, as well as adoptions carried out under State law. The Internal Revenue De-

partment, in a report on the earlier proposal, has questioned the application of the statute on adoptions not occurring under State law.

Third, the revised version of the Adoption Opportunity Act drops a provision which specifically allowed the deduction of medical expenses of the child and the child's natural mother in connection with the birth of the child. It is my understanding that maternity medical expenses are only seldom directly borne by the adopting parents and generally are a part of the social agency fee.

It is my hope that this new adoption bill will gain the wholehearted approval and support of the many Americans who are engaged in enriching the lives of parents and children through the adoptive process—and, indeed, of all Americans.

In the year which has passed since I first introduced legislation in this area, the need to foster adoptions has grown. In many parts of the country the number of children available for adoption exceeds the number of prospective adoptive parents.

A tax deduction would give added encouragement to those couples who may wish to adopt, but are reluctant to do so because of the considerable initial expense which may be involved.

I am hopeful that the House Ways and Means Committee will give this proposal careful consideration when next it undertakes the revision of our Federal tax statutes.

The text of the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1966 follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Adoption Act of 1966."

(a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. ADOPTION EXPENSES.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—There shall be allowed as a deduction the amount of any adoption expenses (as defined in subsection (b)) paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(b) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'adoption expenses' means expenses, pertaining to the legal adoption of a child by the taxpayer, which are incurred in accordance with applicable State or Federal laws, including social or adoption agency fees, court costs, attorneys' fees and other necessary costs and fees in connection with the adoption of the child.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) DOLLAR LIMITATIONS.—The amount of the deduction allowable under this section with respect to any one child shall not exceed \$1,250.

"(2) EXPENSES OTHERWISE ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS.—No amount which is allowable as a deduction under any other provision of this part shall be allowed as a deduction under this section."

(b) The table of sections for part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out

"Sec. 218. Cross references." and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 218. Adoption expenses."

"Sec. 219. Cross references."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

CELEBRATION OF JAYCEE DAY IN GREENSBORO, N.C.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 1, it was my privilege to return to my hometown of Greensboro, N.C., to take part in an occasion that was of not only local significance, but one that has impact throughout the world—or wherever Jaycee International is known.

For, on that date Greensboro celebrated Jaycee Day. Our Greensboro Jaycees celebrate Jaycee Day every day in the work they do in making the community a better place in which to live, work, and play. But, on February 1, the entire community paid tribute to the Greensboro Jaycees; for their constant devotion to civic betterment brought them international recognition as the No. 1 Jaycee International Chapter.

During the last Jaycee International meeting in Australia, the Greensboro organization was selected as the world's most outstanding Jaycee unit—a designation held in this year by no other similar organization. They achieved this signal honor by their own hard work, day by day doing what they could to improve the lot of their neighbor.

Because of their diligence and devotion to cause, some 1,500 persons gathered last week to salute the world's No. 1 club, the Greensboro Jaycees. I was honored to be present on that occasion.

But, I was not alone in paying my respects to the Greensboro Jaycees for their foremost record of service.

North Carolina's junior Senator, the Honorable B. EVERETT JORDAN, said, in part:

It would take as long to recount all the good things this chapter had done as it would to carry on the 14(b) debate.

Robert Scott, Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina and son of the former Governor of North Carolina and U.S. Senator, brought words of praise from the State administration.

The Honorable Joseph M. Hunt, chairman of the North Carolina State Highway Commission and resident of Greensboro, told the assemblage:

The men we honor here tonight believe that Greensboro stands second best to no community on the face of the earth, and that they have the conviction to make that fact abundantly clear to the rest of the world.

Serving as master of ceremonies on this historic occasion was Robert Cox, of New York, former president of the national Jaycee organization and an ex-All-

American football player at the university of North Carolina.

North Carolina Jaycee President Cabell Ramsey presented the Greensboro Jaycees with one of the honors they received that night—the Minneapolis Memorial Award, for having been designated the most outstanding Jaycee Chapter in America.

There were, of course, many others who participated in the program and who helped to arrange this expression of community appreciation under the able chairmanship of Orton Boren. But, those receiving special attention were the club's current president, Richard C. Forman, and the immediate past president, E. S. "Jim" Melvin.

Now the world knows what we have known for many years: the world's greatest Jaycee chapter is located in Greensboro, N.C.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROVES BENNETT BILL TO TRAIN MILITARY REJECTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House of Representatives today that the Department of Defense has approved my legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a special educational and physical rehabilitation program for enlistees and draftees rejected for service in the Armed Forces.

This bill, which I introduced on September 20, 1965, has been modified by the Defense Department and I have reintroduced it in the House as H.R. 12522, a copy of which follows these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of words have been written and spoken concerning our country's draft laws and the need to build up our Armed Forces for the conflict in Vietnam. Very shortly we will have over 3 million men under arms, which is 300,000 more than we now have. It is a sad fact that 50 percent of the young men who volunteer or are drafted are not mentally or physically fit for service. In 1965, 583,530 men were given preinduction examinations for military service, and 292,776 were not qualified. These figures are shocking.

Two of the most famous military rejects of recent years are Cassius Clay, the world's heavyweight boxing champion, who was rejected by the Army for his failure on the mental aptitude test, and New York Jets \$400,000 quarterback Joe Namath, who was rejected because of a bad knee.

My bill would allow for reconsideration of these two famous rejects and others similarly situated who might possibly qualify for military service and serve with other young Americans protecting freedom around the world.

This legislation provides that a significant portion of American youth will be given the opportunity to receive the bene-

fit of educational and medical services enabling them to participate in active military service.

Another direct benefit of this legislation, although it concerns itself with training men for military duty and not for participation in any social program, is that it will upgrade the level of a vast number of American youths who might otherwise be unable to develop themselves into useful citizens.

The Department of Defense would be in a position to modify existing mental and physical standards to permit the acceptance of men with deficiencies correctable in short periods of remedial education or medical treatment.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, has planned to have, at an early date, a full-scale hearing on our country's draft regulations and policies. I am hopeful that at that time complete information will be developed on fulfilling our need for qualified and trained military personnel for our national defense effort and to protect the peace. My bill will go a long way in achieving this goal.

The bill, H.R. 12522, follows:

A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide a special educational training and physical rehabilitation program for persons who are not qualified for enlistment or induction in the armed forces because of educational or physical deficiencies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By adding the following new section:

"§ 2003. Persons not qualified for enlistment or induction: special educational training or physical rehabilitation

"(a) The Secretary of Defense may provide a special educational training and physical rehabilitation program for persons who are not qualified for enlistment or induction in the armed forces because of educational or physical deficiencies but who, with educational training and physical rehabilitation, can serve usefully in the armed forces.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon agreement by the Secretary of Defense and the head of any other department or agency of the United States, facilities, supplies, and services of that department or agency may be used with or without reimbursement to carry out the purposes of this section."

(2) By adding the following item in the analysis:

"2003. Persons not qualified for enlistment or induction: special educational training or physical rehabilitation."

ANOTHER STORY OF DELAY IN SUPPLYING OUR TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House has had some correspondence from back home concerning the shortages in Vietnam. I

would like to ask the indulgence of the House today to listen to an editorial by WSPD-TV of Toledo, Ohio, dated January 25, 1966, on this subject.

The editorial is as follows:

Far too often, in our opinion, stories crop up concerning apparent delays over foulups in supplying American fighting men in Vietnam.

Several weeks ago we reported the exchange of correspondence a woman in Wayne, Ohio, carried on with Federal representatives, concerning alleged faulty combat equipment. Before that we checked into an Associated Press report listing other equipment shortcomings—and got a debatable "white paper" from the Defense Department claiming the allegations just weren't so. Now, our attention's been called by local businessmen to still another item in this same vein.

Recently, a young signal company repairman with the 1st Cavalry Division in Vietnam wrote an earnest plea to a Toledo manufacturer asking if it could please rush him 40 parts for generators needed to supply communications for an emergency field hospital.

The young soldier explained that if he had to go through routine Army channels he'd have to wait 90 days or more, whereas he felt the Toledo manufacturer could get the parts to him in about 5 days.

Needless to say, the parts requested were shipped to him immediately and without charge. Shortly thereafter the soldier wrote his thanks. And this was followed by a note of appreciation from the young man's commanding officer—a note that verified the serious nature of his unit's supply problem and concluded with the words, "your (parts) were a lifesaver."

It is, we think, a sad state of affairs when an American soldier is placed in a position where he feels compelled to correspond with a private manufacturer, offer to foot the bill himself, so he can quickly get the material his unit requires to sustain its war mission.

The frequency of these reports, the red-tape and foulups they suggest or reflect, are worthy of a long, hard congressional look at the workings of our Nation's supply line to the men at the front. A full revelation on this score would be interesting as well as generally constructive.

Mr. Speaker, that is the end of the editorial.

SCOUTING COMMEMORATES FEDERAL CHARTER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include material pertaining to the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to attend the charter year breakfast of the Boy Scouts of America, which was held at the International Inn in Washington, D.C. Purpose of the meeting was to observe the 50th anniversary of the Federal charter granted by the 64th Congress to the Boy Scouts of America and to celebrate the 56th birthday of the organization which was incorporated February 8, 1910.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, was scheduled to deliver an address, but was unable to be present because of a special

assignment by the President to represent him at conferences in Vietnam.

Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., of Ohio, who on that day was the newest Member of Congress to take office, was called by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, retired, the master of ceremonies, to speak instead of the Vice President. He gave a very fine speech which contained some significant facts about the involvement of Members of Congress in Scouting. His cogent remarks were as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.,
CONGRESSMAN FROM OHIO, AT THE CHARTER
YEAR BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 9, 1966

General Clarke, Mr. Brunton, Senator HAYDEN, report to the Nation Scouts, my colleagues in Congress, fellow Scouts and Scouters, see how fast you can rise in the world in Washington. Just a couple of days ago I was the youngest Member of Congress, or the newest Member of Congress, and now I am substituting for the Vice President.

As a tenderfoot in this distinguished body to which I belong, I was a little bit strained to know what I could say about Scouting that would not already have been said by this time in this program and that some of my fellow colleagues and those of you here did not know. So I decided to lean on the newest device of people with problems, and that was research. I made a little survey of the membership of the U.S. Congress to try to answer the question of what Scouting has done for the Congress in view of the fact that we would be discussing this morning what Congress had done for Scouting 50 years ago. I was surprised, as I think you will be.

As a result of my effort to gather some statistics on Scouting in the Congress I found out that 249 of the 535 Members of the Congress of the United States today have been Scouts or Scouters. Now, as a member of one of the minorities in this country—the Republican Party—that impressive total in Congress is very encouraging to me. I know the Republicans would like to have that many Members in Congress. I will tell you a little bit about that later.

Two hundred and one Members of Congress have been Boy Scouts. One hundred and twenty-nine of them have been and are, and many of them still are—and this is a message for those of you who talk to people who say they are too busy. Many of them are still Scout leaders. Eighty-one Members of Congress have been Scouts and are Scout leaders today, and 48 of them have been leaders only. One hundred and twenty of them have been Scouts and have not continued their Scouting as volunteer Scouters. One hundred and thirty-four of the responses I got indicated that they had been neither Scouts nor were they Scout leaders and I hasten to point out to you, as was pointed out to me on a couple of these sheets that I got back, they were not Scouts because, in some instances, they were too old.

In other words, Scouting was not available when they were growing up and in a number of instances they were not Scouts because in their area, geographically, or because they came from what now is being called disadvantaged areas, there was no Scout troop. I trust that we will cure that in the next 50 years as we have made great strides in curing it in the past 50 years.

The reason I could not get a total of 535 responses is because there are, or were when I took the survey, 3 vacancies in Congress and also because 12 of the seats in Congress are held by women. Two of these women, CATHERINE MAY, of Washington, and FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, ought to be in this survey, although I just could not bring myself to include them because Mrs. MAY, last year, became an honorary Boy Scout through a council in her district and has

confused her daughter, or at least made her daughter something unusual in school, because she goes to school now and tells people that she has the only mother in the country who is a Boy Scout. FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, says that she was not a Boy Scout but she sure worked like the dickens being a den mother.

To be a little more serious, I would like to give you just a moment of my background. I moved to Washington with my predecessor in this seat in Congress when I was 12 years old and soon after that joined Boy Scout Troop 5 at St. Alban's Church, up near the Cathedral. In that troop I became a senior patrol leader and an Eagle Scout, and later out in Ohio served as an assistant scoutmaster and just this past summer have been involved in some work in Tecumseh Council in southwestern Ohio to encourage boys to respond to the theme, "Follow the Rugged Road." I would not have been a Scout, however, and I am sure I would not have been an Eagle Scout, and I am sure perhaps, too, that I would not be here today as a Member of Congress if it were not for the man who made my Scout troop and my Scouting experience possible, and he is here this morning and I would like for you to meet him. He is John Bayless. John, will you stand?

John was my Scoutmaster and was active in Scouting in the National Capital Area Council and in Troop 5 for about 35 years. He is retired from Scouting now to devote his full time to trying to make a living and to make a cathedral. He is curator of the Washington National Cathedral up on the hill. To him and to the other Scout leaders and to the Boy Scouts who are here representing the Scouts of the Nation, as a Member of Congress I would say that you have kept the trust expressed in you some 50 years ago by Senator HAYDEN and others very well. Congress presented you a charter and perhaps in many respects, you have given us back a Congress.

I would like to read for you the names of the Eagle Scouts in Congress and also to give you the names of some of the top Scouters in the U.S. Congress. The Eagles include Representatives GEORGE F. SENNER, JR., of Arizona; BURT TALCOTT, of California; CHARLES BENNETT, of Florida; CHARLES WELTNER, of Georgia; DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois; JOHN CULVER, of Iowa; HERVEY MACHEN, of Maryland; GERALD FORD, of Michigan; THOMAS CURTIS and DURWARD HALL, of Missouri; BARBER CONABLE and RICHARD OTTINGER, of New York; HORACE KORNEGAY, of North Carolina; MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota, and myself and BILL STANTON, of Ohio; TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; DANIEL FLOOD and RICHARD SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; J. J. PICKLE, of Texas; JOHN MARSH, of Virginia; HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, and Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah. I don't trust myself to comment on the fact that there is only one Senator on the list.

The adult Scout leaders with special honors are Senators CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, and GEORGE MURPHY, of California, both Silver Buffalo; Representative from Missouri, DURWARD HALL, Silver Antelope, and Silver Beaver, and Senators CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina, and Representatives TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, and DEL CLAWSON, of California, Silver Beavers.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for what you have done with your charter.

Mr. Speaker, special guest of honor at the charter year breakfast was Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate and only living Member of the 64th Congress which granted the charter to the Boy Scouts of America. Chief Scout Executive J. A. Brunton, Jr., presented to Senator HAYDEN a beautiful plaque containing a mo-

saic tile inlay of the original charter and a statement of "affection, esteem, and gratitude" for the great contributions Senator HAYDEN has made to Scouting as a Member of Congress.

Senator HAYDEN's response was contained in a letter which he had prepared and framed for the occasion:

Senator HAYDEN's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

Fifty years ago, a bill, H.R. 755, was introduced in the 64th Congress of the United States. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, and the Senate on May 31, 1916. It was duly signed by the then Speaker of the House, Hon. Champ Clark, and by the Honorable John H. Bankhead, the President pro tempore of the Senate. The bill became law upon approval of President Woodrow Wilson on June 15, 1916. Section 3 of the act states:

"The purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organization, and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts."

As a Member of the 89th Congress, who was also a Member of the 64th Congress, I greet and commend you, the members of the Boy Scouts of America and leaders of your 95,000 local chartered institutions, on this 1966 Boy Scout Week, which features and recognizes the golden anniversary of the charter.

The magnificent accomplishments of the Boy Scouts of America over the years, under the Federal charter have fully justified the confidence of the Congress and the people of our Nation. As a further evidence of national appreciation several of my colleagues joined with me in introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution S. 68, on January 14, 1966, which states in part:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the Charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth."

I have every hope that the Senate will adopt and the House of Representatives will concur in this resolution.

The need for the Boy Scouts of America is as timely today as it was in 1916. I would remind you that the purpose for which the charter was granted remains, and urge you to continue to pursue diligently your objectives to make Scouting available to all boys in every community throughout our beloved America.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senator from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, also honored at the charter year breakfast were 14 Scouts and Explorers chosen by merit to represent 5,732,708 members of the Boy Scouts of America at report to the Nation activities during 1966. These fine young men were later to have the high privilege of a visit with the President of the United States at the White House and reported to him concerning the progress, achievements, and activities of Scouting. Eagle Scout James C. Smith, 17, of Columbia, Tenn., spoke for the Scouts; and National American Legion Commander L. Eldon James, of Hampton, Va., responded in

behalf of the 95,000 local institutions who sponsor Scouting units.

Some historical highlights of the Boy Scouts of America were presented on stage in a visual and in the printed program. Since these highlights reflect the tremendous role that Scouting has played in the strengthening of America through its program of character building, citizenship training, and physical fitness, I wish to incorporate them in my remarks:

Boy Scouts of America incorporated February 8, 1910, under the laws of the District of Columbia.

Sea Scouting for older boys started. Boys' Life became the official magazine 1912.

Federal charter granted to the Boy Scouts of America, June 15, 1916. Number of chartered institutions at the close of the year was 9,500. Membership totaled 245,183.

Unprecedented service rendered by 418,984 Boy Scouts to World War I effort. Scouts sold over \$200 million in Liberty Loan bonds and war savings stamps, 1919.

First World Jamboree held in England attended by 301 Scouts from United States, 1920.

Outstanding good turns rendered in forest conservation throughout the country. Membership reached 513,015, 1921.

First National Training School for Scout Executives opened, 1925.

The Cub Scout program formally launched, 1930.

The Mortimer L. Schiff Scout Reservation dedicated, 1933.

Membership passed the million mark and the 5 millionth copy of Handbook for Boys was published. Sea Scouting was implemented by adoption of Explorer program for older boys, 1935.

First National Jamboree held in Washington, D.C. Attended by 27,232, 1937.

National rededication to Constitution of the United States and Declaration of Independence. Philmont Scout Ranch, Cimarron, N. Mex., given by Waite Phillips to the National Council, 1938.

Total resources of the Boy Scouts of America placed at the disposal of U.S. Government for duration of the war. Services included distribution of defense bonds and stamp posters, collection of aluminum and wastepaper, cooperation with American Red Cross and Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, 1941.

Boy Scout war service continued. More than 500,000 Scout victory gardens grown—20,000 earned the Gen. Douglas MacArthur medal for growing food, 1945.

Forty thousand Scouts and leaders attended the Second National Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa. First Boy Scout stamp issued by U.S. Post Office Department, 1950.

Thirty-three percent gain in membership announced as result of the "Strengthen the Arm of Liberty" program launched in 1948. Boy membership at the close of the year was 2,579,515, 1951.

The National Council office moved to its new location near New Brunswick, N.J. Boys' Life circulation passed 1 million mark. Unprecedented membership growth continued to alltime high of 3,774,015, 1954.

Thirty-six million Liberty Bell doorknob hangers placed by Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorers in get-out-the-vote campaign, 1956.

Fifteen millionth copy of Handbook for Boys presented at White House ceremony. Over 50,000 Scouts and leaders attended Fourth National Jamboree, 1957.

The new Explorer program launched, 1958.

Scouting's golden jubilee year celebrated. Membership total over 5 million. Highlight was Fifth National Jamboree at Colorado Springs, Colo. Johnston Historical Museum dedicated at New Brunswick, N.J., 1960.

In Greece, 621 Scouts and leaders from the United States attended the 11th World Jamboree, 1963.

Strengthen America's Heritage program launched in cooperation with Freedoms Foundation. Sixth National Jamboree held at Valley Forge, Pa., 1964.

The program of emphasis breakthrough for youth inaugurated. Total Boys' Life subscriptions, 2.4 million. Five hundred thousandth Eagle Badge awarded. Membership at close of year was 5,732,708. Cumulative membership 1910-65 exceeded 40 million. Over 21 million Boy Scout Handbooks distributed since 1910, 1965.

Fiftieth anniversary of Federal charter from Congress. At the beginning of the charter year, the total number of chartered institutions exceeded 95,000—which is 10 times greater than the total chartered institutions in 1916. Number of units is 144,538, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the charter year breakfast launched a nationwide emphasis on the partnership with cooperating agencies as defined in the charter. Key leaders in the field of religion, education, civic and community life in every local council of the Boy Scouts of America will be invited to a special meeting of the executive board to consider ways and means of working together in bringing the Scouting program to more boys, especially in the congested inner-city and deprived rural areas. This will be followed by relationships conferences in every one of the 2,750 districts with heads of institutions that are present or prospective sponsors of Scout units.

In closing may I reiterate a conviction which is shared by all of us that Scouting is a vital force in strengthening the foundations of freedom in our beloved country and throughout the free world. For the boys themselves it is fun, adventure, and activity that helps them to grow in personal and social development, gives them a sense of moral values, and motivates them to do their duty to God and country.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF MR. BERNARD KIM

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the economy today there exists a substantial amount of unemployment not because there is an inadequate number of jobs for those willing to work, but because a large portion of our manpower is untrained in the skills that are actually in demand. It has been estimated that there are at least 2 million that are structurally unemployed and who need additional training to become employable. This situation means that there is considerable strain on private industry seeking to attract and retain skilled workers. This fact, if coupled with the fact that the industry is involved in defense production, creates a situation of national importance.

I am introducing today a private bill which will relieve this pressure in one

specific instance that has been called to my attention. Mr. Kim, the beneficiary of this private bill, is originally from South Korea but has just recently had his status in this country adjusted to that of permanent resident. He is currently employed as a heat transfer engineer by Emerson Electric in St. Louis. Mr. Kim's special skills make him necessary and valuable for much defense work of a confidential nature undertaken by Emerson. I have thus introduced a bill which would accelerate his application for naturalization and allow him to engage in this work which would be beneficial to the country.

AMENDING TARIFF SCHEDULES TO ENCOURAGE MONTESSORI INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues, Messrs. DON H. CLAUSEN, UTT, BURKE, RIVERS of Alaska, WELTNER, and YOUNGER, in introducing a bill which I believe will encourage the teaching of preschool children under the renowned Montessori system. This bill would amend the tariff schedules of the United States to allow certain special educational materials which are a necessary ingredient of the Montessori system to be imported into the United States free of duty.

Various items in the present tariff schedules allow for free importation of many kinds of educational materials. However, these items are not broad enough to include the unique Montessori apparatus. This apparatus consists of various wooden boxes, beads, balls, and other objects of specified sizes and shapes. These items are not presently manufactured in the United States because every step of the hand manufacturing process is under the surveillance of the Montessori pedagogical committee in Holland. With continued expansion and increased demand perhaps American manufacturing may undertake this in the future. At present, however, these materials are not produced in the United States because of the high cost of their manufacture.

The Montessori method is premised upon the theory of "self mastery and mastery of environment through the exercise of liberty." Physical manipulation of the specially designed equipment teaches the child self-mastery during certain especially sensitive periods of his development. Dr. Maria Montessori originated the system in Italy shortly after the turn of the century. It has proven to be remarkably successful in both Europe and the United States, which has seen a significant increase in the number of such schools. There are now between 175 and 225 such schools in the United States, which teach about 18,000 children. Experience has shown

that the Montessori method has aided normal as well as subnormal children of widely varying cultures and backgrounds.

The elimination of duties on Montessori method teaching materials should be considered favorably as a means of encouraging education at the preschool level and as an encouragement to experimentation in our education systems. These innovations should not be retarded by U.S. tariffs, all the more so when there is no competing U.S. product. More broadly, however, the elimination of duties on Montessori teaching materials should be considered a part of the larger effort to remove duties by mutual agreement with other nations on items of scientific, educational, and cultural use. This is the substance of the so-called Florence agreement, an international agreement pending enacting legislation, which I have supported for years and which, during the present session, I hope will at last receive the attention it deserves.

RECORD OF ADMINISTRATION AND RECENT ELECTIONS

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was introduced in the daily RECORD an article showing that the administration has won very few elections in the past year.

That was before the results were known of the election in New York City to fill the seat left vacant by the elevation of our former colleague John Lindsay to be mayor.

Into that special congressional election, the administration threw everything it had from money to Lyndon B. Johnson's and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S personal influence, not to mention that of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Despite this, the administration received a sock in the jaw. It lost even though the Republican candidate was relatively little known, and a third candidate affected the vote.

Now I understand a move is underway to reverse the results with a recount. The remnants of Tammany still control election machinery in New York. Whatever the result, one thing is clear—the administration got another blackeye, a bad one, at the polls yesterday in New York.

TAX SHARING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, every 55 minutes during the year 1964, someone was murdered in the United States. Every 5 minutes there was a holdup. Local law enforcement agencies are at their wits' ends trying to stem the rising tide of crime and keep the streets safe for honest citizens. It is high time that the Congress took a hand in helping the cities to combat this national disgrace.

I am today introducing legislation to return a portion of the tax money collected by the Treasury Department to the States for use in law enforcement. The money would be returned on the basis of State effort and concentration of population, helping those who are most in need and encouraging the States to allocate more of their own funds to this use. The money could be used freely by the State and city law enforcement agencies, without the endless strings which are attached to the ordinary Federal grant. In this way, the States and cities could adapt these added resources to their own particular needs.

The crime rate in the United States has risen six times as fast as the population since the year 1958. Murder alone jumped by 8 percent in 1964, assault by 17 percent, rape by 21 percent, robbery by 12 percent. All crimes of violence increased by an average of 12 percent. In figures, the total murders for that year were 9,289, while there were 185,000 assaults, 111,753 robberies, and 20,551 reported cases of rape. There were 1.1 million burglaries.

The crime rate in larger cities and metropolitan areas is nearly twice that of smaller cities, and the rate of smaller cities nearly twice that of rural areas. The national crime rate for 1964 was 1,361.2 violent crimes for every 100,000 people. In large cities the rate was 1,699.1 for 100,000.

Other urban areas outside of major cities showed a rate of 948.9, with rural areas showing a rate of 549.4 per 100,000. These figures show the necessity of a plan that weighs the aid according to density of population.

The overall crime rate for the Nation has risen 22 percent since 1960. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has not completed its statistical analysis for 1965, but all educated guesses are that the rate will have climbed even higher.

The cost of combating this tremendous increase in criminal activity has risen sharply, too. Unfortunately, many cities do not have the resources to spend enough money to keep up with the task. The cost of combating crime in New York City rose 33 percent last year and the Nation as a whole spends over \$30 million a year on all phases of crime prevention and detection and in replacing damaged or stolen property.

The Federal Government has pre-empted so much of the national income through the Federal income tax, that local and State governments are hard pressed to meet and pay for their basic costs of government, such as law enforcement.

My bill would help State and local governments meet their problem, law enforcement, and yet safeguard local control, where it ought to be.

Badly needed aid will be brought to the States through the legislation I am introducing, for those who are most in need of help will receive the most. The money can be used as the local agency sees fit—for the hiring of more policemen to bolster their force, for offering higher salaries and benefits to attract better men, for purchasing better detection equipment, for better training programs to prepare men for their dangerous assignments, for the hiring of clerical help to free more policemen for on-the-beat service.

It is a sad but well-documented fact of life that the best deterrent to crime is the presence of more and better law enforcement techniques.

As the percentage of criminals apprehended increases, others take warning. Similarly, few crimes are committed when there is a patrolman in sight. New York has recently demonstrated this by adding 800 men to their subway police. Subway crime dropped by 60 percent. The experiences of other cities bear out the same findings.

Electronic computers have resulted in a significant increase in arrests in several cities, but these, like hiring new policemen, cost more money than many cities can afford.

Now, it has always been the prerogative of the States and cities to carry on the law enforcement activities, and any Federal aid must be without strings and redtape, leaving the people on the spot free to decide how and where to spend the money. At the same time it is important that the Federal Government not encourage the States to be lazy in their own efforts. I think this Tax Sharing for Law Enforcement Act which I am introducing accomplishes both of these goals.

The concept of tax sharing, as opposed to grants for every little project, is an attractive one to anyone who values the concept of our federal system and who believes that local problems are better understood locally than here in Washington. The field of law enforcement is one area which must be kept in the hands of the cities and States. With the tax sharing system, this local control can be retained while we help the States with funds that they could not otherwise obtain.

The amount of money to be set aside each year for division among the States is equal to approximately 1 percent of the total taxes collected by the Internal Revenue Service this year, or \$700 million. As the taxable income and the tax collections increase each year, the amount available for the State allotments will also increase.

I am confident that the legislation I propose will be welcomed and supported by the countless Americans who long for a return of the good old days when we could walk on the streets at night without fear of attack.

BROCK OPPOSES FREEMAN TOBACCO PROPOSAL

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, an important controversy sparked by a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture proposal has developed over the proper size of the 1966 burley tobacco crop.

Secretary Freeman has offered two bad alternatives in this regard. In a USDA release issued on January 29, Mr. Freeman announced a referendum for burley farmers to be held on March 10 to make a choice of what appears to be the lesser of two evils—a 15 percent acreage cut or a 6.3 percent acreage increase accompanied by a poundage quota.

In the crop year, 1966-67, the conservative estimate for total burley consumption is estimated at 635 million pounds. Production this year will approach 625 pounds. A 15 percent cut in current acreage allotment would cut production to about 530 million pounds—a shortage of 105 million pounds. This is a blatant mistake. Each farmer's income potential would be dangerously impaired. Over one-fifth of consumer demand would be unsatisfied in terms of current production.

In other words, this alternative is not acceptable, and, thus, the farmers would be virtually compelled to accept the second alternative—that of poundage controls. By the USDA's own allegation, poundage controls would permit an exact yield estimate by strictly controlling productivity through restricting the farmers' freedom to intensify technical processes and thereby increase yield.

Because a farmer's average allotment is prorated with the less efficient producers, his incentive to initiate and implement technological improvements is stifled at the outset. Certainly, this is in direct opposition to the basic principles of our free-enterprise system.

Our overriding objective should logically be to equate burley tobacco production with demand while preserving the essence of our free economy. It seems apparent that the best way to achieve this objective is simply to maintain the current acreage program which would yield a crop of approximately 625 million pounds.

The greatness of our farm economy, which exceeds any other nation on earth, is due to the incentive each farmer has under freedom to improve his quality, increase his yield through scientific planting, fertilization, and so forth, and maximize his efficiency through utilization of modern tools. Secretary Freeman's proposal would weaken if not destroy this incentive.

I urge that Secretary Freeman reevaluate his position on this matter and revise the March 10 referendum to include the alternative of maintaining last year's crop acreage program.

AN OPPORTUNITY AND A PREDICTION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in all the confusion that now reigns in Washington, the one fact of life that is continually brought to mind is the overall political mentality of the Johnson administration.

Few will deny that the President's state of the Union message was basically a political campaign document through which he will attempt to eradicate what is left of the Republican Party and impose his Great Society on the public through a rubberstamp legislative body.

There are many columnists who are turning increasing attention to the prospects in the fall election and wondering whether our two-party system or more specifically, the Republican Party will stage the necessary comeback needed to produce stability in our governmental structure.

The Chicago Tribune, which throughout its history has been a determined supporter of the great virtues of our country, is properly concerned over the defects of the Great Society and the political consequences that face us. In an editorial on Sunday, January 16, the very distinguished editor of the Tribune, Mr. William D. Maxwell, expressed his views on the coming election period. I insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

AN OPPORTUNITY AND A PREDICTION

Much is going for the Republicans in this congressional election year, but the question is: Will they manage to blow it again? There is a developing disenchantment with Mr. Johnson, both in his foreign operations and his domestic undertakings. He has a war on his hands which he doesn't care to win and hardly can afford to lose. At home, he is all over the lot with schemes to throw around vast sums of tax money.

These embarrassments, imbroglios, and deficiencies present the Republicans with an opportunity to make hay if they have the wit and can suggest alternatives. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the minority leader, has stated the truism, "Parties do not defeat each other; generally speaking [they] defeat themselves. A party becomes the victim of its mistakes and blunders."

Seen from this viewpoint, the Democratic mistakes are so major in character and of such a vast scale that no party out of power has been presented with more breaks by its opposition than have the Republicans. Their situation has never been as desperate as some of the party woesayers have represented it. In 1960 the presidential election was stolen from Richard Nixon in Illinois and Texas. A shift of 11,000 to 13,000 votes—properly distributed in a very few States would have reversed the result of the election.

In 1964, the tragic death of President Kennedy, suddenly loading the burdens of office on Lyndon Johnson, won Mr. Johnson widespread sympathy, and he was swept into a term of his own on a tide of emotional reaction. His supporters, also, did not hesitate to indulge in slander, misrepresentation, and defamation of Senator Goldwater.

Since then Mr. Johnson has adopted substantially the same suggestions which Mr. Goldwater advanced for fighting the war in Vietnam, although his hesitant dance between "peace offensives" and slugging has

made it difficult to impress the enemy with the steadfastness of his purpose. Temporarily with the enemy will not win a war, it will not win a peace, and it will not stave off an enlarged war in the future.

Americans viewing the Great Society at home can hardly escape the conviction that, whatever else this conglomeration of spending projects may be, they are highly political in intention and hugely expensive in production. One deficit succeeds another in the Democratic budgets, on an ever-enlarging scale, and the monetization of this vast debt has brought about a chronic inflation which, if permitted to continue, can spell ruin.

The fiscal policy of the administration is out of the atmosphere of Alice in Wonderland, with \$113 billion budgets to the accompaniment of the chants of practitioners of the "new economics" that the Nation can afford every scheme in the welfare state bundle while fighting a war at the same time. President Johnson subscribes to this doctrine, and has assured George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, that he is "determined to press ahead in building the Great Society" while meeting the American commitment in Vietnam.

As we have mentioned, that commitment gets foggier by the moment, with the administration slipping notes to the Communist enemy, holding off its bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and disclosing a total inability, if not a lack of will, to press for victory. The mightiest military machine in history cannot apply the necessary power to defeat what is at most a fourth-rate nation, if it be called a nation at all, assembled, as it is, from the segment of another nation, with its ruling clique despised and resented by a large part of a captive population, held against its will in a sealed-off tyranny.

The Democrats came to the White House 5 years ago deploring what they called a decline in the prestige of the United States throughout the world. What has their own performance done to improve it? The irresolution in Vietnam, the irresolution at the Bay of Pigs, the Kennedy guarantee of a continuing lease on life for the Castro regime in Cuba at the time of the missile confrontation with Khrushchev in 1962—are these the kinds of things that win the respect of the world?

We find the United States snubbed these days by the imperious President de Gaulle, of France. We find the NATO alliance at the very verge of dissolution. We are insulted almost daily by Cambodia, an insignificant Asiatic state. Our press representatives are kicked out of Moscow and Indonesia. We cannot prevail upon our allies, such as Britain, Canada, France, and Spain, to cease trading with Castro and Ho Chi Minh. We are frightened of Red China and lose no opportunity to curry favor with the bosses of the Soviet Union who only wish us ill.

Britain once more reneges on her debt, but the President is so much at the disposal of the British Socialist Government that he joins the boycotting and blockading of unoffending Rhodesia, which has had the effrontery to declare its independence of Britain, as the American Colonies once did.

What more could any party out of power wish to present to the people than an opposition record like this?

Yet the thing that can still defeat the Republican Party is the division in its ranks. Time after time in recent years the Dunn survey at Washington has reported that there is a conservative majority in this country, and equally regularly it has predicted, correctly, that liberal Republicans would defeat their party once more.

In 1964 liberal Republicans lost no occasion to tell the American people that the presidential candidate of their party, a loyal and outstanding leader, was incompetent, irresponsible, dangerous, and an extremist. Liberal Democratic leaders opportunely ex-

plotted the lead of their Republican brothers to defeat the national Republican ticket. This was no contest between a conservative Republican Party and a liberal Democratic Party. The first loyalty of liberal Republicans is to the biparty liberal movement, even at the cost of the Republican Party's defeat. Those Republicans who resent these continuing sellouts by the defectors are brushed aside with the word that no conservative can ever hope to win.

If this schism persists—and we see no evidence that it will not—the Republican Party will go down to another defeat next November. The result will be accomplished by pseudo-Republicans who are committed to "wars on poverty" and all of the rest of the schemes in the welfare state kit. It will be accomplished by Republicans who are ashamed of the label of "Republican" and want to be known as "independents."

It will be accomplished by those who style themselves "modern" Republicans and think that the hallmark of modernity is to emulate the Democrats to the greatest extent possible. It will be accomplished by lethargic Republicans, who can't be bothered to work for their party organizations, to get out the vote, and to vote themselves.

It will be accomplished by selfish Republicans, many from the business community, who say, "We have never been more prosperous, and we are doing very well, thank you." It will be accomplished by Republicans who are flattered by a summons to the White House—and what if the crusher is applied when they try to raise prices to offset wage increases wrung from them by administration pressure?

As we say, much is going for the Republican Party, but is the Republican Party going for itself?

Mr. Speaker, we who serve in this legislative branch recognize privately, if not publicly, that there has been an abdication of congressional responsibility in our check and balance system. I believe all the Members would benefit if they would study and review the facts as laid before them in the editorial which I have just inserted. It speaks volumes in practical wisdom.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, on rollcall No. 15, I was unavoidably detained in my office on business. If I had been present and voting on that rollcall, on H.R. 12563, I would have voted "yea."

OUR NEWEST REFUGEES— MISSISSIPPI NEGROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to complete my statement before yielding.

Since the beginning of civilization the world has always had refugees. It has had refugees from natural calamities such as earthquakes, flood, and drought. It has had refugees because of war, famine, and epidemics. It has had refugees fleeing from political and religious persecution.

As civilization has advanced, the world began to have special compassion for, and to take special care of, those unfortunate people who for one reason or another were driven from their homes and forced to start life anew elsewhere.

The United States has never created refugees. We have always harbored them. But today, in the State of Mississippi, we are creating refugees—hungry, homeless, and jobless refugees. They were not created by war or famine or any of the other classic causes. They are refugees because of a carefully calculated conspiracy being waged against them by the State of Mississippi.

Some of these refugees have left the State to crowd the already intolerable black ghettos of our major northern cities. But others remain homeless—actually homeless—in their native State. Before overproduction of farm products, especially cotton, and the introduction of efficient farm machinery, every Negro hand was needed in the Mississippi Delta. Children almost as soon as they were able to walk were put to work in the cotton fields and they ended their days in these same fields. With the introduction of more efficient farming methods, first the children were no longer needed. Then the women were eliminated. Today we see the elimination of vast numbers of farming jobs for the men. Even those who have acquired skills, such as tractor drivers and machinery maintenance men.

This problem was not created by Mississippi. This problem has been faced by many States in many areas before. We have seen, with the advance of technology, the elimination of products and of crops causing large-scale revision in economy of an area. But the difference is that almost always when economic disaster faced citizens of a community or a State, steps were taken on some governmental level to solve the problem and help the people.

For example, when the coal fields of Pennsylvania ran into economic difficulty, the local communities, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with Federal aid, brought in new industries. And, today, these areas that were economically depressed 10 or 15 years ago are thriving. When Massachusetts textile manufacturers moved on down to the South, Massachusetts communities worked to replace this industry with other industry such as electronics and plastics. Neither the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania nor the State of Massachusetts set their policies in such a manner as to drive their people out of the State. They understood their responsibility to the people of their State regardless of their national origins or ra-

cial backgrounds. Somehow they found the necessary money and provided the leadership so that those people did not go homeless or hungry during the transition period while they were being trained for new jobs.

But how is the great State of Mississippi meeting its responsibilities? This mass displacement of farmworkers in the Mississippi Delta did not develop overnight. Farm labor experts have known for a long time that this would occur and would be accelerated especially after the development of the mechanical cotton-picker. According to the best available information Mississippi State officials made no plans to find jobs for those who were displaced by automation. Further, they made no plans to create jobs for those people who wanted to remain in their home State. As technological unemployment continued to rise in Mississippi we did not see large-scale retraining programs instituted to prepare men and women for new jobs in new industries.

Thousands of Negro families long accustomed to existing on substandard minimum incomes now found themselves living with no incomes at all, and with no help of any kind available to them from local, county, or State governments. They are not assisted by the most minimal welfare programs that would permit them to be fed, clothed, and housed. No emergency relief measures were taken by the State. The behavior of the State toward its unemployed and poverty-stricken citizens constituted a massive catalog of indifference to misery and suffering that, with the possible exception of our brutal treatment of the Indians, is unparalleled in American history.

Not content with simply playing a passive role in permitting these hardships to continue, the State of Mississippi has assumed a very active role in preventing outside assistance, provided for the most part by the Federal Government, from reaching the needy. I will not talk about the failure to provide decent minimal shelter against the elements needed by homeless people, many of whom were evicted from the land. I will not talk about the abysmal failure of the State to help these people find new job opportunities. I do, however, want to talk about that most basic of all human needs, food.

Mississippi's refugees are hungry. With a median income of only \$450 a year, the delta Negro could never put any money away for a rainy day. Now that rainy day has arrived, and he has no savings to draw upon with which to buy food. He has been thrown upon the mercies of his Government. The United States responded to the need. The Department of Agriculture launched Operation Help, and earmarked \$25 million worth of surplus food for hungry refugees, above and beyond the normal food welfare program. Having failed in its own obligations, one would think that the State of Mississippi would have been delighted to have the U.S. Government assume its burden and take the responsibility of distributing this food to an estimated 500,000 people that need it.

But one should not underestimate the determination of the Mississippi power

structure to force its Negroes not only off the land but out of the State completely. Except for some small token deliveries, the food did not move to the tables of the needy. The Department of Agriculture, to its credit, asked for and received an allocation of \$1.2 million from the Office of Economic Opportunity to set up its own machinery for food distribution. As of this moment, this effort has been met not just with an iron curtain of obstruction, but with outright hostility. Volunteer efforts by private citizens, notably the delta ministry of the National Council of Churches, were also harassed and repulsed by State officials forcing the abandonment of this humanitarian effort.

These obstructive tactics have been so successful, that only 13 of Mississippi's 82 counties have distributed surplus commodities to all poor people. The eight counties in the delta have made no food distribution at all. Operation Help, intended to relieve the plight of hungry men, women, and children, is itself in desperate need of help.

What manner of man is a Mississippian who would refuse food to the hungry—food that has been provided and paid for by somebody else, and that costs him nothing to distribute? What manner of man is the American whose conscience does not cry out in protest at this outrage?

These are not academic questions. The problem is with us right now—this very day, as we stand here and discuss it. Just last night Associated Press carried a dispatch on its wires stating that the Washington County Board of Supervisors voted against the continuation of a program to distribute surplus food to impoverished families. Washington County is the site of the Greenville Air Force Base where a small group of Negroes squatted last week and demanded food, land, and jobs. The AP dispatch pointed out that the program rejected by the board would have lengthened by 3 months the current food distribution program in the county. Its extension would not have cost the county any money. Of course, this should not surprise us too much, since all food distribution was successfully prevented by the people during the prior period when the program was supposed to be in effect.

Just so that we do not confuse the Government food program with dining at the Ritz Carlton, let us understand what this food we are talking about actually is. It consists of: flour, shortening, canned beef, grits, rolled oats, dried skim milk, and peas. This is not exactly gourmet living, but it will help keep people alive and reasonably healthy.

The denial of food is a major weapon in a conspiracy that Mississippi is conducting against its Negro citizens. The conspiracy has many weapons which include physical violence, beatings, and bombings. But new, more sophisticated, silent weapons, like intimidation, financial strangulation, eviction, and starvation, now seem to be in vogue. They have not replaced violence. They have just been added to the arsenal.

The aim of the conspiracy is to make conditions of life for the Negro so utter-

ly intolerable as to force him to leave the State and make a new home for himself elsewhere. There is no facet of life in Mississippi where this conspiracy is not operating. I had the opportunity to see it running in high gear late last November while the Agriculture Department's ASCS elections were being held. Despite the Department's determination to have these elections conducted fairly, I saw innumerable examples of fraudulent and discriminatory practices whose effect was to nullify the Negro vote. The results of these elections emphasize the effectiveness of these tactics. In a State whose farm population is overwhelmingly Negro, only 3 Negroes were elected to local ASCS committees out of a total of 285 committeemen. I brought back many affidavits and signed statements describing the vengeance exacted from Negroes who ran for ASCS seats, who engaged in political activity, who enroll their children in integrated schools, who work in the civil rights movement and who in other ways, attempt to break the code and demonstrate their independence as human beings. I am inserting some of these statements into the RECORD, including letters I wrote to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Attorney General.

One of the things the ASCS elections proved was that frequently Federal employees are responsible for subverting Federal programs. It is one thing for us to sit in Washington and establish programs and policies. It is quite another thing however, to have them executed out in the field by individuals who were born and raised out in the local areas and are affected by the same local prejudices that their lifetime neighbors are. The Federal paycheck does not cleanse a man's soul, rebuild his character or change his allegiance. Consequently, as I have already suggested to administration officials, it will often be necessary in order to assure compliance with Federal policies in the South, to put administrators out into the field who come either from Washington or other sections of the country.

Only yesterday we learned that a \$13 million Air Force base was to be given—free and clear—to the city of Greenville and the State of Mississippi. We were told that the State would establish a vocational school and a junior college. I violently oppose this costly gift because like many other Americans—I cannot bring myself to believe that a people so actively working to prevent food from reaching the barren tables of starving Negro families can be expected to give Negro students fair and equal educational treatment at those proposed schools. As part of the grand design of the conspiracy, Negro educational opportunities in Mississippi are at rock bottom. Are we to make this State a gift of the airbase as a regard for long years of neglect and abuse toward a majority of its citizens? What right do we have to hope that the policies and attitudes of the State will suddenly undergo a miraculous change at the proposed schools? What possible excuse can there be for making this valuable gift to a local government that has demonstrated time and time again its

complete indifference to the suffering, feelings, and needs of its Negroes?

I am sure that we will soon hear all the standard bromides that we have heard in the past from our Mississippi friends. They will talk about the Harlems in the North—and conveniently overlook the fact that with all its poverty and squalor, there is nobody in Harlem as hungry, as cold, or as ragged as a Negro in rural Mississippi, because the city and the State recognize their responsibilities and provide welfare to those in need. During the recent cold wave, heated armories were opened up and hotel rooms were even rented for the use of people that needed them. Compare this to the gunpoint evictions of shivering people in Greenville. And, while Harlem schools leave much to be desired, I am certain that most Negro parents in Mississippi would gladly exchange the quality of education in the two places.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman yield on that particular point?

Mr. RESNICK. I would be very happy to yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman referred to the gunpoint observations. What State officials used a gunpoint, or even pulled a gun?

Mr. RESNICK. I did not say State officials. I am aware that it was the Federal Government.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why did not the gentleman say it was the Federal Government?

Mr. RESNICK. I said "gunpoint officials." I did not say State officials.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman feel that he has adequately covered this subject to the point where it will assure his reelection this fall?

Mr. RESNICK. I do not believe that is the point, but I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that less than 3 percent of my district is Negro.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman will also note—

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, we will also be told that the civil rights movement is Communist-led and that the cry for freedom in Mississippi is inspired by the leftwingers. As a matter of fact, there may be a small germ of truth buried inside this charge. There undoubtedly are some leftwingers and other assorted characters agitating in Mississippi, anxious to turn the distress of the Negro to their advantage. But if this is true, it is only because of the almost total failure of America's respectable white middle class and political leaders to take the necessary initiative demanded by conditions in the Deep South. There are too few organizations like the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and the National Council of Churches, which, through its delta ministry, has done a

magnificent job in attempting to alleviate the misery of the Negro refugees. Unless other voluntary and government agencies wake up to the problem, we may well find that leftwingers have taken exclusive title to the effort to bring justice to Mississippi Negroes, and have turned it into a weapon to suit their own political objectives. If this ever happens, we will have only ourselves to blame. But in all fairness to those who suffer poverty, let us not make the deadly mistake of confusing cause and effect. The hungry and homeless are there now and it is our decision alone as to whether they will be helped to a better life or whether they are to be abandoned to the designs of leftwingers.

It would be an inexcusable crime and blunder if we allow the just aspirations of our Negroes to become subverted by Communists. The only way to avoid this catastrophe is for the respectable elements in every community to grab the reins of leadership and act now.

How ironic it is that I, a New York Congressman, should be standing here now bemoaning the fate of citizens in the State of Mississippi. How much more logical and meaningful it would have been if my colleagues from that State took the floor to express concern for their fellow citizens. If Mississippians need food and are in difficult economic circumstances, why are not their elected representatives banging at the administration's doors to insist upon accelerated Federal aid? Why do not they exercise their influence back home to see that obstacles to food distribution are removed? We know why. They consistently inveigh against so-called Federal intervention, and then—stone by stone—build the social and economic structure that makes such intervention unavoidable. I invite all my colleagues to stand here with me on the floor and join in this call for social and economic justice for all of the people—in all 50 of our States.

I call upon the Secretary of Commerce to launch an intensive effort to help establish new progressive, equal-opportunity industry in the State of Mississippi that will provide jobs for the State's unemployed. I call upon the Secretary of Labor to double and redouble manpower retraining programs to give displaced agricultural workers the technological skills that will prepare them for 20th century jobs. I call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to press forward, through the Rural Community Development Service and other agencies, to help alleviate economic distress in the rural areas, and to continue with renewed determination the attempt to distribute food to the needy of all races in Mississippi. I call upon the Attorney General to listen to, and take forthright action upon the cries and pleas of Negro citizens who do not yet feel it is safe for them to exercise their right and privilege to participate in democratic elections.

Finally, and most important, I call upon my fellow Americans in the State of Mississippi to come forward with compassion and understanding, and open their hearts to the distress of their fellow men—their brothers under God—

who share with us the vision of America as the land of plenty, the land of equality, and the land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material:

DECEMBER 3, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recently returned from Mississippi where as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I was asked to investigate voting irregularities in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service elections. As these are the first elections the Negroes of Mississippi have ever participated in in any numbers I felt it very important that these charges be investigated. I am preparing a report supported by affidavits which I am sending to Secretary Freeman which shows beyond any question that these irregularities did in fact take place aided and abetted by the Federal employees of the ASCS.

The State of Mississippi has stated that its policy is to drive the Negroes out of Mississippi. Many have left voluntarily but those remaining are beginning to realize that the ghettos of the north are a dead end for them and hold no promise for a better future. The white people of the State of Mississippi, in addition to physical violence, have now intensified their economic harassment in order to force the Negroes off the land and out of the State. This is vicious in itself but in addition they are now subverting local Federal employees who administer Federal programs in Mississippi so that these Federal programs that are designed to help all Mississippians are instead being used against Negroes. Stated very simply, the Negro in Mississippi is not receiving the benefits that the white person is. This is true not only in agriculture but in welfare, education, and especially in housing.

Right now 100 Negro men, women, and children are living in a makeshift "tent city" outside of Greenville, Miss., having been thrown out of the plantation shacks where they had formerly lived. The plantation owners have announced that between 10,000 to 12,000 additional Negroes will be thrown off the plantations next spring as they are no longer required due to the cutback in cotton planting.

In spite of the fact that this potential human disaster is well known in Mississippi, not one single State or Federal employee or agency has made plans to cope with the extremely unfortunate situation.

Mr. President, knowing of your compassion and interest in the welfare and well-being of all Americans, I am asking you to look into this terrible situation. I am sure that once the facts of this situation reach you that you will act as you have in the past. You have exemplified the American spirit of generosity and human warmth in your recent actions in behalf of the Cuban refugees and the Vietnamese paraplegics. I am sure that you will do no less for these unfortunate Americans.

Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Member of Congress.

DECEMBER 4, 1965.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party requested me to visit Mississippi prior to the ASCS elections to investigate their allegations of voting irregularities.

I spent 2 days in Mississippi, and even though this is a short time the voting irregularities were so flagrant in the three counties that I visited that I came away convinced that all other ASC elections in

Mississippi were being run on the same basis. The enclosed report describes in detail the irregularities which I investigated.

In Issaquena County, I learned that the FHA would not loan money to Negro farmers for anything except the production of cotton. This was thoroughly incomprehensible to me as I know it is the stated policy of the Department and of the Congress to cut back on the production of cotton and encourage diversified farming. On the other hand, white farmers in Issaquena County could receive FHA loans for the production of wheat, soybeans and cattle.

I also received complaints that the Negro farmer could not receive loans to build decent housing from the FHA whereas the white farmers could. In riding through the countryside you could see very quickly the difference in housing between the white farmer and the Negro. I further learned that the local officials of the Department were by and large white Mississippians, and even where they lived up to the letter of the law they violated the spirit of it. They refused to address the farmer by his proper title, be it Mr., Mrs., or Miss. They refused to talk to the people on the phone; they must come to the office to be seen; and all in all are hostile to the Negro.

I know that this is a problem that you have inherited and I in no way feel that you condone or encourage these practices. I feel, however, that the time has come for positive steps to be taken to eradicate the two standards of service from the Department once and for all.

I strongly suggest that a commission made up of educators, businessmen and clergymen investigate all of the charges and allegations. If we do this we will demonstrate to the Negro as well as the rest of the country that there is one standard of justice for both white and black.

I also feel very strongly that in certain counties where there is prima facie evidence of wrongdoing, these county ASCS agents should be either fired or transferred immediately.

One other problem which is reaching the desperation point is the distribution of surplus commodities to the starving Negroes, especially those in rural areas. Mr. Secretary, this is not a case of local government interference—this is a generalized determined effort on the part of the local governments and individual plantation owners to prevent this food from reaching the Negroes in the delta.

I also urge you to send one of your aids there to talk not only to the elected officials and department employees but speak to the men, and women from the National Council of Churches. I did, and I was frightened at the lengths these people will go to keep the Negro from taking his rightful place in American society. One instance in particular that I recall: a farmer was fined \$149 for transporting surplus food from a depot to the outlying plantations. The State police claimed that he did not have the proper type of license plate.

Mr. Secretary, I am asking you to look into this terrible situation. I am sure that once the facts of this situation reach you that you will act resourcefully and generously to end the imbalance of services provided through the Agricultural Department.

With best personal regards,

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., December 7, 1965.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

On Monday, November 29, I went to Jackson, Miss., at the request of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, to hear their complaints of irregularities in the election of

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service committees and to investigate their allegations.

I spent Monday night, all day Tuesday and Tuesday night, and part of Wednesday morning in these discussions and investigations. The local offices of the Extension Service had been alerted in advance of my visit and where possible I discussed my findings and questioned the local agent. I also heard personal accounts of individual Negro farmers and am attaching their affidavits.

The following is a summary, by county, of my findings:

ISSAQUENA COUNTY, MISS.

Negro wives: Ballots were not mailed for Negro wives voluntarily. They had to be requested.

Insurance: Negroes active in ASCS elections had their insurance canceled.

Results of elections: Results of last year's ASCS elections had not been published and the candidates were not notified.

FHA: Loans were refused to Negroes for anything but the production of cotton. White farmers were able to get loans for grain, soybeans, and cattle. Negroes were discriminated against in the amount of money that could be borrowed for housing.

HOLMES COUNTY, MISS.

ASCs elections: I spoke directly with the county agent, Mr. McWilliams. He informed me that he had mailed out ballots to all Negro wives who were coowners of record. This was not true. There were 30 men and women at the meeting I attended who had not received their ballots. He refused to give challenge ballots without deeds. He did not get voting rolls up to date. He refused to accept cotton gin receipts as proof of eligibility from sharecroppers. He insisted on a written statement from the white owners. Further he refused to give these people challenge ballots.

MADISON COUNTY, MISS.

Mr. Hodges, county agent, attended a mass meeting of farmers in Madison County which I also attended. He gave a deliberately misleading explanation of which wives were entitled to a ballot. I had to correct him and offer the proper explanation based on the information furnished to me by the Department. In addition, he refused to address the Negroes properly, insisting on calling them by their first names.

The attached synopsis and affidavits were furnished to me by the Reverend Barber of the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches. The point was developed that counting of the ballots will be conducted in the smallest ASCS room available. As I understand it no provision was made for a formal inspection by the Negro community. Further points brought out at the meeting: the Negro farmers had to prove their yield ratings on cotton, while the white farmers word was taken. In addition, sharecroppers do not receive receipts for the sale of their cotton. They are paid by the owner as he sees fit.

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Member of Congress.

DECEMBER 3, 1965.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have recently returned from Mississippi where as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I was asked to investigate voting irregularities in the agricultural stabilization and conservation elections.

As these are the first elections the Negroes of Mississippi have ever participated in in any numbers I felt it very important that these charges be investigated. The Federal Government has made a commitment to the Negro people, especially of the South, that

it will secure equal treatment under the law. If this election is not conducted legally with all the safeguards guaranteed under the law, we will have broken faith with the Negro.

I found evidence that Negroes are being discouraged from voting in the elections by intimidation and economic reprisal; that Federal officials deliberately in a precalculated and identifiable pattern obstructed the registering of qualified sharecroppers; that ballots were flooded with Negro candidates' names—without permission and in some cases over the objection of the individual—in a deliberate attempt to split the Negro vote; and many other voting irregularities.

We are a nation of laws—yet I came away from Mississippi convinced that the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and the fair administration of Federal programs—Head Start, OEO Community Action, and other welfare programs; FHA, as well as education and agriculture—are being repealed by nonenforcement—in effect being repealed because the local citizenry won't obey them and the Federal Government has not vigorously enforced them.

Although these sharecroppers are living in Mississippi, their problems affect the entire Nation. The history of the Negroes' desperate search for a better life in the cities of the North is woefully apparent in the ghettos of Chicago and Harlem. Their lack of education in urban living, lack of skills in an age requiring highly trained technicians but few unskilled laborers, and the social problems which years of injustice have created—have poorly equipped them to leave the farms of the South. Their despair has erupted in Harlem and Los Angeles. Those who remain are beginning to realize that the ghettos of the North are a deadend for them and hold no promise for a better future.

The State of Mississippi, however, has a stated policy to drive the Negro out of Mississippi. The white people of the State, in addition to physical violence, have now intensified their economic harassment in order to force the Negroes out of the plantations and out of the State.

Right now 100 Negro men, women, and children are living in a makeshift "tent city" outside of Greenville, Miss., having been thrown out of the plantation shacks where they had lived and worked. The plantation owners have announced that between 10,000 to 12,000 additional Negroes will be thrown out the plantations next spring as they are no longer required due to the cutback in cotton planting. In spite of the fact that this potential human disaster is well known in Mississippi, not one single State or Federal employee or agency has made plans to cope with the extremely unfortunate situation.

These people will need temporary housing immediately to withstand a cold winter, with agricultural surplus foods delivered by Federal authorities—as the State authorities will not distribute them through the normal welfare department procedures or permit other agencies to do it for them. From a long-range point of view, they will need all of the resourceful thought and planning which we can provide—in order to stimulate the creation of new jobs and to train these people for them.

What is even more important, however, is that Federal programs in Mississippi be administered impartially. This is a difficult goal to obtain when the Federal officials administering them are natives of Mississippi, often giving their loyalty to the region before the Nation.

It is my belief that the State of Mississippi will not comply with Federal statutes or provide the benefits of Federal programs to Negroes voluntarily, where they conflict with the white establishment's vested interests and prejudices. Evidence of this is

found in the lengths to which the white Mississippians have gone to circumvent laws and in many instances ignore them.

The fear which is being generated in the South—with whites and Negroes distrusting one another—must also be controlled by adherence to law—and not allowed to develop into a full-scale guerrilla war which would disgrace and shame us all. If we as a people do not secure the rights which we guarantee by law to all of our citizens, regardless of color, it is my terrible feeling that what happened in Watts will be a tea party compared to what will happen in Mississippi.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
Member of Congress.

MARKS, MISS.,
January 13, 1966.

Congressman JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RESNICK: We of the Quitman County Freedom Democratic Party have been having very bad problems with the commodities program here. We have contacted Mr. Neal Freeman, of the Department of Agriculture, who has promised that he will have a Department of Agriculture official here within 2 weeks. Unfortunately, we know that such promises are often not carried out unless there is pressure from Congress and other sources.

The main problems are:

In order to obtain commodities, the Income and Resources form must be verified and signed by some white person. The words "landlord, employer, or * * * some responsible person" (see enclosure) have in practice this effect. Among other things, this makes it more difficult for people who live in the towns to obtain commodities.

The second problem is that persons must stand outdoors for 8 to 10 hours although there is a large shed nearby which is empty and heated and could easily be rented to give some shelter. The weather is very bad and people are very poorly clothed and shod.

Also, plantation owners will send gangs of their people in ahead of the town people who still have to stand in line waiting. Mr. Dan Ashley (the warehouse manager) is a planter himself and it is believed that he has an arrangement with the other planters to do this. Also enclosed is an affidavit concerning this, made out by a person who lives on a plantation.

The Negro people here need the commodities in order to survive, and very great suffering is caused by the mismanagement of the program. It is merely a cheap way for the planters to "furnish" their tenants.

We would like for you to (1) insure that a Department of Agriculture official is sent here within 10 days or so to correct the program; (2) introduce an amendment to the law providing money for shelter to be provided for people who are waiting for their commodities, if there is none provided already.

There have also been complaints that some people entitled to commodities have not received them, but we don't have any concrete evidence on this as yet.

For the Quitman County Freedom Democratic Party:

GEORGE SHELTON,
Chairman,
Freedom Labor Union.

(NOTE.—Our number is (601) 326-9441,
511 Cotton Street, Marks, Miss.)

ASCS, BOLIVAR COUNTY, COMMUNITY "F"

The following information is based on information that was spoken to me by Negro farmers in ASCS, community "F" in Bolivar County and on personal observations made by me in the ASCS office in Cleveland:

Almost all of the Negro farmers in community "F" received ballots only for them-

selves and none for their wives, although their wives' names also appeared on the deeds. When some of them tried to get ballots for their wives they were sometimes given the ballots and sometimes told that their wives were not supposed to get ballots; that there was supposed to be only one ballot for each farm. One farmer who was told that presented his deed to them and they told him that his wife's name appeared first and that she was entitled to a ballot. Another farmer to whom I spoke said that he brought his deed with his wife's name on it to the office and that they never did give him a ballot for her.

When we went to the courthouse to watch the ballot counting there was no announcement of the place of the counting on the bulletin board. We inquired at the office and they sent us to a small room in the back of the office. No chairs were provided for the spectators. When we asked why they said that they were expecting to use the courtroom but that a trial was then in process.

It is my impression that no one person is supposed to vote more than once in any given county in an ASCS election for committeemen. During the counting of the ballots there was no check made to see if anyone had voted in two different communities in Bolivar County. They appeared to be removing duplicate ballots (removing one of the two that had the same name) that occurred in the same community but I personally saw three envelopes from which ballots had been removed and counted in the community "F" election that had been signed, apparently by the same person using the same pen for all three signatures, "Mello Sandroni." Mello Sandroni was elected as the vice chairman of community "F."

It is my feeling that the treatment that the Negro farmers received from the people in the ASCS office in Cleveland when they attempted to get ballots for their wives, the lack of concern for the comfort of the interested public at the time of the counting of the ballots and the casualness with which the ballots were counted, resulting in the counting of three ballots from envelopes bearing the same signature in one community for a fact and possibly in other errors not as gross, merits a thorough investigation of the present staff of the ASCS office in Cleveland and necessitates the calling of new elections throughout the county.

One more irregularity comes to mind as further corroboration of the allegation herein made that these elections were improperly conducted. One Negro farmer was not allowed to have his name placed on the ballot because he supposedly had not farmed during the past year. His ballot was counted and his votes recorded for the election in community "F." The requirements for being placed on the ballot are identical to those for voting.

Each of the individuals who supplied information contained in this report has stated his willingness to sign a written statement of those facts that he has verbally stated to me.

RON WEISS.

DECEMBER 8, 1965.

REPORT ON A MEETING WITH MISS EVELYN GANDY, STATE WELFARE COMMISSIONER, ABOUT PROJECT HELP—JANUARY 3, 1966

(By Mrs. Annie Devine)

MISSISSIPPI FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY,
Jackson, Miss., January 7, 1966.

Mrs. Palmer and I visited about 1 hour with Miss Gandy, who was very friendly and answered our questions as limited and as reserved as she could get away with.

Question 1. Has the State advisory committee for Operation Help been set up?

Answer. No. We are so busy we really have not found time. Many county supervisors boards have not approved the plan. The

State welfare department is concentrating on getting the program into the five counties that do not have any kind of commodity or food stamp program. (These counties are Jefferson Davis, Copiah, De Soto, Tate, and Noxubee.) Hinds County has an all-needy family program, and so it will not be considered as part of the program directly. They will also not have the program where there are food stamp programs in effect (that is, in Lowndes, Chickasaw, Coahoma, Jones, Harrison, and Madison Counties).

Question 2. Are applications for jobs with Project Help now being accepted by the local welfare offices.

Answer. Yes. People should apply for jobs under this program now. She's quite sure there will be no discrimination. People will be placed on a qualification basis. For example, some people can fill the bags with commodities.

Question 3. Since the project is a 6-month demonstration, it seems time is running out to get organized. We would like to submit names for the State advisory committee. We will send them to your office soon.

Answer: Yes, by all means submit the names. We will get fair representation on this committee. Counties will set up their own committees. Supervisors boards will be meeting today, hope they will approve the plan.

Question 4. There was discussion on the welfare program in general. Miss Gandy said that 80 percent of the funds used for welfare come from the Federal Government. Mrs. Palmer and Mrs. Devine said that there obviously weren't enough funds to have a program that meets half the needs of the people.

(NOTE.—A list of names recommended by the MFDP was sent to Miss Gandy on January 6, 1966.)

Project Help is the 6-month food distribution and education program which is being run in Mississippi under the poverty program—Office of Economic Opportunity. For more information on this program, see the report on the visit to the State welfare office about this program, on page 9.

Several county FDP's have already been to see their local welfare offices about the program. Following is a summary of several of these visits.

Bolivar County: Committee went to the welfare office on December 20. They submitted a written proposal with the names of people they recommended for the county advisory committee, as well as suggestions about how the program should be publicized, and where food distribution offices should be set up in the county. We were told by the manager that he had been sick for the past 3 months and knew nothing about such a program. "The only program I know anything about is the county program and it is operated with county funds. There have been no funds from OEO for a food program that I know of."

When he was shown the information from FDP he said a committee had been elected 4 or 5 months ago to supervise any money that was granted to the State by OEO but when asked who this committee was he revealed only one name. He looked at the proposal and handed it back and told the committee to go to the chancery clerk's office, maybe someone there could help us.

He also wanted to know where we got such information, who we were, where we lived. He talked a lot about the county office and how it was run, but he could not give the committee any information about the Federal program. He says there won't be any additional distribution points, or jobs to be offered (from Mr. Velma Bartley, Shaw).

Issaquena County: A delegation went to the county welfare office on December 22. The woman in the office said she didn't know anything about the program. Her name is Lucia Shipp.

Jackson County: Three people went to the county welfare office around December 20. The administrator, Mr. Goff, said he had not received any information on the program, but he had received a memorandum from the State welfare office saying that the money was here in the State, but only for those counties that are not getting commodities. They asked about the supervisory board of the Help program, and he said it was white only. They asked about jobs for people in the program, and he said they didn't need to hire anyone because convicts could do the work for free (from Mrs. Nettie Sellers).

Quitman County: Nine people, including six ministers, went to the county welfare department on January 7. The woman in the office, Miss Duke, said the county will distribute commodities until April, and then will participate in Help during May and June. The department of welfare has already picked the people to be on the Help advisory board. It is integrated, but there are no poor people on it (from George Shelton).

Sharkey County: Sometime between December 20 and 30, a committee talked to Mrs. Kate Herring of the county welfare office. She said the only thing she knew about the food distribution program was what she read in the newspapers.

Winston County: On December 30, a committee went to the county welfare department to talk to Supervisor O. B. Edwards. He said he had just been down to the employment office to see if any Negroes wanted jobs (apparently he would use them in the Help program). The committee asked Edwards not to hire anyone until they had made their recommendations. Edwards agreed, and said he needed one college graduate to serve in an administrative capacity, and several people with less education.

If you go to your county office to ask about the program, please send us a report. We will send the Bolivar County proposal to anyone who would like to see it, in case you are planning a visit to your local welfare office, and would like to see it for an example of what such a proposal could look like.

MICHIGAN-LOWNDES COUNTY, ALA.,
CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS,

Detroit, Mich., December 7, 1965.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, JR.

DEAR SIR: I am sending you a letter from the Lowndes County movement, concerning the recent election that was held there. I received another one and a call since this election that many of those Negroes that are renting land from the whites, and have been for many years was threatened, that they would have to move away from their land if they registered and voted; some did, and they have been driven off the land. I cannot locate the letter, maybe our secretary has it. I am positive this is a fact. What I want to discuss with you, is there anything can be done to stop this kind of action. Someone said in one of our meetings, that they were told this same thing occurred in another Southern State, maybe Tennessee, and the Government ruled against such action on the basis of a human exercising their rights. If there is some legal issue involved, would you write a letter to the movement in Alabama, address it to Mr. William Cosby, Jr., Route 1, Box 144, Tyler, Ala., you may tell him I brought it to your attention. I am sure he can give you the full details of the situation there. I am sending this letter for the purpose of you getting some information, about the work of the movement there. If it is possible for you to stop by Saturday at our party and speak about 15 minutes, you will have this much in advance, although I would like to have a word with you before. If you deem necessary to write me, my ad-

dress is 2508 McDougall, Detroit 7, this is our secretary's address on the above.

Sincerely yours,

SIMON P. OWENS, Sr.

—
TYLER, ALA.,
November 27, 1965.

Mr. SIMON P. OWENS,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR FRIENDS AND WORKERS: We the Lowndes County Christian Movement for Human Rights, enclose you will be able to read a brief report of the county election that was held a few weeks ago, on the ASCS committee, that means the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service these are the names that we submitted to the program, that won over the whites—Mr. John Gilham, Sidney Logan, Jr., Richard C. May, Streety Reeves, Emory Ross, the alternates are Mr. Mathew Jackson and Percy Johnson, this committee will control all the cotton allotment, they will work with the white people in the ASCS committee office when time comes to do the planning or disbursing of the allotments to the farmers, I wrote Mr. Owens last week pertaining to this election, and also I explain some of it to him, and he will tell you the, or give you the information that I might leave out, we are still working hard with the voters drive we now have almost (2,000 registered voters) since the start in March, there are also 1,900 white voters in the county. We are still working hard trying to get our people to get registered. It's a hard job to do, but we are determining to get at least 3,000 or more out of the 5,000 that are qualified to vote.

On November 26 a group of us went to Federal court to appear in a hearing on the suit that we file against the county a few months ago, pertaining to Negroes being on jurious we hope to know in about 30 days the verdict, but our lawyers were satisfied with the case after the three Federal judges adjourn the court, the trial was held in Montgomery at the Federal building the Lowndes County whites really did show them self to be ignorant in court, and we had a good testimony to give.

This pamphlet might will help you toward more information about the ASCS elections.

We have also had the movement incorporated with the State of Alabama, it cost us \$110 to get this done, so now you can see that we are operating direct through the State of Alabama. We appreciate all that you have done for us, and still are doing.

Yours very truly,

THE LOWNDES COUNTY CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, INC.,
JOHN HULLET, *President.*
L. S. MCGILL, *Secretary.*
WILLIAM COSBY, *Advisory.*

AFFIDAVIT

I am Lillie Ray Johnson, 42 years old, and a resident in community "C" of Bolivar County, Miss., living at Route 1, Box 198, Mound Bayou, Miss. I was denied a ballot in the 1965 ASCS elections, even though my name appears on the deed to the farm which my husband and I jointly own and operate.

Mrs. LILLIE RAY JOHNSON.
ROSS JOHNSON,

Witness.

E. DREXEL GODFREY III.

Witness.

Date: December 9, 1965.

—
CANTON, MISS.,
December 15, 1965.

Congressman JOSEPH RESNICK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RESNICK: Here is some information concerning the recently conducted Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service election in Madison County.

It appears that a directive was received from Washington stating that minority candidates must represent the proportion that is in the farm population. In our case, this was interpreted to mean that Negroes must be on the ballot in proportion to their number in the county. Thus, the local ASCS official instructed the community committeeman to place twice as many Negroes on the ballot as whites. There were five positions for elections, and five white names on the ballot in each community. There were 8 to 12 Negro names on the ballot in each community. This had the effect of splitting the Negro vote, making it impossible for Negroes to win in most communities.

Of those extra Negroes placed on the ballot by the white committeeman, several were placed there without their knowledge and approval. In community "B" three Negroes reported having their names appear on the ballot without their being asked. They were Willie Holmes, Walter Paton, and Cleo Thomas. Two other Negroes agreed to have their names placed on the ballot but did not know what they were running for, or anything about the election. In community "C" three names were placed on the ballot, although they had told the chairman of the community committee that they did not wish to run, and would not serve. They are Walter Nichols, Jr., Tolston Dozier, and Ollie Williams. In community "F" one man, Joseph Harris, Jr., has informed us that he refused to run and was still placed on the ballot by the community committeeman. It was rumored in that area that two others were similarly placed on the ballot against their will, but have been unable to contact them. In community "G" one man, Wish Evans, found his name on the ballot although he had not been contacted by anyone about running. This pattern would indicate that the election was not run in accordance with the rules.

There is one other instance of a man being placed on the ballot against his will. This was one of the winning candidates in community "E" who is white. His name is John Bill Devine, he won a seat as an alternate in that community, although he did not wish to run. The Devines have been afraid to complain, because of the trouble they have had for being friendly with Negroes.

In these communities we had placed Negroes on the ballot by petition, after they were selected by the people meeting in their local churches.

We also find that many sharecroppers did not receive ballots, although they were entitled to them. It appears that it is the practice for the ASCS office to send out official mail addressed to the sharecroppers in care of the plantation on which they live. Thus, many ballots were waylaid by the owners of the plantation. Since the owners normally conduct all business with the ASCS office, it worked a hardship on the sharecroppers to go to the office to receive his ballot. This is documented for communities "A", "C", and "E." We feel that this pattern must be broken, if all eligible voters are to begin to participate in a just and democratic fashion.

Wives of farmowners are eligible to vote if their names appear on the deed. We have evidence to show that the wives of white farmers could easily procure their ballots, while Negroes had more difficulty. We also feel that the burden should fall on the ASCS office and not on the individual. The office has FHA records available to it, so that this could easily be done.

There were some other instances of infraction, but these are the major ones. Statements and affidavits have been sent to the USDA, and we are hoping for some action.

Sincerely,

Rev. RIMS BARBER.

HERNANDO, MISS.,
December 4, 1965.

DEAR SIR: In De Soto County there has been a history of discrimination ever since farmers have tried to organize and run candidates in the ASCS election.

On August 2, 1965, three farmers went to the ASCS office to find information on the election. They were Carella Jackson, Route 2, Hernando; Willie Catley, Route 2, Hernando; and R. D. Suggs, of Olive Branch. The office manager, Mr. Ballard, only answered a few of their questions even though he was very pleasant. He said he didn't know if a list of eligible voters could be brought to the office. He didn't know when the election would be held. When he was asked the qualifications needed to run in the election, he told them, "a farmer in the community". He didn't mention anything about being overage or being convicted of crimes or an officer of a political party.

A few weeks later farmers went to the ASCS office and asked to look at the list of eligible voters. He said he didn't have one, and quickly changed the subject. They also asked for a map of the election districts and he said he didn't have an extra one. Every time he was very nice. He just didn't give the information needed.

This same sort of discrimination is true of the ASCS program. Very few farmers even know who the community committeemen are, because they never talk to the small Negro farmers. This leaves all of the programs designed to help the small farmers in the hands and destiny of the large white plantation owners.

Now that the election is here, none of the farmers have been asked whether or not they wanted to be on the ballots, except the white plantation owners who are running for reelection and the many Negroes who put their names on by petition. Many Negroes, at least five on each ballot were stuck on the ballot without their permission. Some were sent letters asking them whether or not they wanted to run in the election, some were not. Some Negroes who were put on the ballot said that they didn't want to run in the election. Some didn't reply to letters asking them whether or not they wanted to run in the ASCS election. However, whether they said they didn't want to run, all of the Negroes who the white plantation owners wanted on the ballot got on.

The following Negroes whose names were on the ballot either did not receive any notice asking them if they wanted to run in the ASCS election or when contacted did not say that they wanted to run in the ASCS election. This is how it ran in just two of the seven districts:

Community B: Dempsey Johnson, contacted, "yes," answer, "no."; Willie Mosley, contacted, "yes"; answer, no reply; Percy Black, contacted, "no"; Archie Miller, contacted, "no"; Emmitt Gibbs, contacted "no".

Community C: Elbert Robinson, contacted, "no"; Johnnie Tate, contacted, "no"; Mack Banks, contacted, "yes", answer "no reply"; Charlie Woods, contacted, "no"; James Holmway, contacted, "no".

No wives of Negroes have gotten ballots unless they owned separate crops. This can be proved by the list of eligible voters.

Fraser Guy State Line Road and Seinea Road, Memphis, Tenn. He took his wife to the office to get a ballot. They said he couldn't get a ballot because he didn't have a deed with him yet. When the county committee counted the ballots on December 2 two wives were disqualified because their names were not on the deeds. There is little doubt that they were white wives. This is why the wives were not on the eligible list.

The following are a few of the people who did not receive ballots.

All 11 people on the Mint Farm in Olive Branch.

At least three people on the Russel Summers Plantation (county ASCS chairman) in Pleasant Hill; Robert Freeman, John Eddie Gray, Roy Taylor.

In district C Sandy Betz got 73 votes. The lowest winning vote was 81; 8 votes different. Add all of the Negro wives' votes, add 14 votes that Mack Banks received without counting or wanting to run and add all of the Negroes who didn't get ballots. Who won then?

Yours for freedom,

TANZIE G. BACCHUS.

I am a Negro farmer in Madison County, community C. One day, about 2 weeks ago, Mr. R. T. Foy came to Folston Dozier and me in the field. He said that he had orders from Washington that there had to be Negro committeemen. He said that he could not find anyone to serve in this community and asked Mr. Dozier and myself to serve. I said, "I don't think I'm qualified." He said that he would help me if I was elected. I said that I wouldn't want to have to be told by someone else how to work on the committee. As he left he said, "Would you serve if elected?" I said, "No." Mr. Dozier also said that he would rather not. He said, "I'm going to put both you and Dozier on."

The above is true to the best of my knowledge. Given and signed in Madison County on November 25, 1965.

(Signed) WALTER NICHOLS, JR.

Witnessed:

Mr. Ollie Williams of Highway 51, south from Canton, is on the ballot for the December 2, 1965, ASCS election in Madison County, community C. Mr. Williams is 73 years old, and thus ineligible to serve.

Mr. R. T. Foy asked Mr. Williams to serve, but Mr. Williams declined, because of his age and poor health. Mr. Williams has cataracts, so he sees poorly, and heart trouble. Mr. Williams sent Foy to see another man, who happened to be in community D. Mr. Foy went to see the man, found out that he was just across the border, and returned to see Williams. He told Williams that he would just put his name on the ballot.

This information was given to me this 25th day of November 1965 before a witness, Mr. Ralph Sowell in Mr. Sowell's store on Highway 51.

RIMS BARBER.

AFFIDAVIT

November 30, 1965.

I, Columbus Green of Mayersville, Miss., Box 24, have been farming in Issaquena County, Miss., for several years. I have the following statement to make to the Department of Agriculture:

I applied for FHA loan to build a house and break some land. I wrote to Washington, D.C., about it and they sent a man to talk to me in Rolling Fork. He said I had to own the land, so I sent for my mother and they said she'd have to sell me the land. But I'd leased the land for enough years to make me eligible. Then they said they'd give me a loan but it wasn't enough to build a house and clear the land. Have three children in the integrated school. Wife tried to run in ASCS election but wasn't eligible. My house burned to ground yesterday. Don't have nothing now.

(Signed) COLUMBUS GREEN.

Witnesses:

JOSEPH MANOS, Mayersville, Miss.

TOBE HIBE, Jr., Box 56, Mayersville Miss.

November 29, 1965.

I, Gregory H. Finger, 832 Lutz Avenue, Canton, Miss., make the following statement of my own free will. On the morning of Saturday, November 27, 1965, I visited Mr. Walter

Payton, a farmer and storeowner in Madison County ASCS Community B. The following is what took place:

I talked with Mr. Payton about the ASCS elections and told him that his name appeared on the ballot. He said that he hadn't looked at the ballot yet and that he was not aware that his name was on the ballot. I asked him if any of the incumbent committeemen had approached him and asked for his permission to put his name on the ballot. He said that they had not done so, and then he asked his wife if they had approached her and she said that they had not. I asked him if he wanted to be on the ballot, and he told me that he did not want his name on it.

He told me that a white man, a Mr. Phipps, had come to his store earlier in the week and said, "Walter, I see they got your name on the ballot. I'm going to try and help you win." Mr. Payton said, "What ballot?" Mr. Phipps said, "Never mind, I'll come back next week and talk to you about it."

After Mr. Payton had related the above to me, I wrote it down in affidavit form, and asked him to sign it. He refused to sign it, saying that he wanted to consult his lawyer first. I returned to his place on November 29, 1965, and asked his wife if he had consulted his lawyer yet. She said that he had not yet done so.

The above statement is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Given this 29th day of November 1965, at Jackson, Miss.

(Signed) GREGORY H. FINGER.

Witnesses:

IRENE N. BARROWS.
H. BRONSTEIN.

ISSAQUENA COUNTY,

November 15, 1965.

Statement of Mr. Hurns, Route 1, Box 44, Glen Allan, Miss.: The sheriff (Mr. John A. Darnell) came to me on this morning. He asked me if I knew the civil rights workers had my name on the ASCS petition to run for community committee and that I would be running against his brother (Mr. G. W. Darnell). I told him the people had asked me to run and I told them I would. Therefore I knew my name was there. I asked the sheriff would it be any danger or harm my name being there. He said certainly it wouldn't be any value or profit and he advised me as a friend to go to Mr. Jack Vance (county agent in ASCS office) and take my name off. He said he just wanted to protect his neighbors. I presumed from his conversation it was quite a risk. I thanked him and went down to the ASCS office and told the lady in the office to take my name off. Mr. Jack Vance was not in.

RUFUS HURNS.

AFFIDAVIT

NOVEMBER 25, 1965.

I, Fred Morganfield, of Route 1, Box 144, Rolling Fork, have been farming in Issaquena County, Miss., for 18 years. I have the following statement to make to the Department of Agriculture:

The day the bossman (Don Hagan, Grace, Miss.) told me to move I'd been working and came in for dinner. Bossman said he had another family to move in (no one ever did) and that we'd have to be gone by next day. The same morning my wife had registered Joe and Lester (Morganfield) in the white school in Rolling Fork. Three weeks before this he took another son's pay (\$9.75 for 3 1/4 days of work) and put it on my debt. I said I didn't take my family's pay to pay my debt, but he took it anyway. About 2 months before we moved, Mr. Don told me he didn't want any civil rights workers in our house, and if they came he'd have to "make arrangements" to get them away from there one way or another. All he ever did was ask us to move, so I reckoned that's what he was

talking about. The workers had been coming back after he said they should stay off.
(Signed) FRED MORGANFIELD.

Witnesses:

LEXINGTON, MISS.,
December 8, 1965.

Mr. RAY FITZGERALD,
*Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I am sending you this relatively short note because I want to give you immediate notice of our complaints against the conduct of the ASCS community committee elections here in Holmes County, Miss. As soon as possible I will be sending you a more lengthy and complete report of our complaints against the irregularities in the elections.

This is not the first time we have tried to register our complaints and protest of the elections this year; when I was in Washington as delegate to President Johnson's Conference on Civil Rights in November 1965, I made and kept several appointments with gentlemen in your Department in Washington. On November 19 I spoke personally with several of them and attempted to obtain redress of the wrongs being perpetrated at that time by the Holmes County county committee and office manager, Mr. Will McWilliams. Then, as now, I came forward in behalf of the several hundreds of Negroes who participated or should have been allowed to participate in these ASCS elections here in Holmes County.

Our complaints are several and I will briefly list them for you here:

1. From the very beginning Mr. McWilliams' lists of eligible voters were extremely inaccurate and incomplete. From this several injustices flowed. First, several hundred people did not receive proper written notice of their rights to participate in the elections. And also, it was made extremely difficult for Negroes to add their names to his eligible voter list and thus receive the proper information and ballots.

2. Even after I complained of this during my visit to your office in Washington, and even after the Holmes County ASCS office supposedly received directives to hand out challenge ballots, the Holmes County office would not issue out these challenge ballots. Thus continued the great difficulty Negro voters had in obtaining the necessary information and forms to participate in the elections. It was only when (and with quite a bit of luck) U.S. Congressman JOSEPH RESNICK happened to be in Holmes County and hear of our plight and himself spoke to Mr. McWilliams that the Holmes County office did begin to issue the challenge ballots. This was a piece of happenstance and occurred but 2 days before the deadline for ballots to be in and thus did not in any large measure redress the wrong.

3. Because challenge ballots were issued only after Mr. RESNICK spoke with Mr. McWilliams on the evening of November 30, most challenge ballots were not issued out in enough time for them to be filled out and returned before the December 2 deadline. No allowance was made for these late challenge ballots and therefore these ballots were treated just like any other ballots (even those that had been mailed out properly by the office on November 22) received with late postmark and they were not counted.

4. The printed instructions and the information given out at the ASCS office about how illiterates should sign their ballots was such that illiterates were led to believe that they should make their mark and get a witness to sign his own (that is, the witness') name; however, the county committee would not open or count any of the ballots signed

in this way. The county committee disregarded all illiterate ballots that did not have also the name of the illiterate printed by the witness on them. Thus, because the office did not make this procedure clearly known, many illiterates' ballots were not counted.

5. The county committee would not open or count any of the ballots that were signed in ways different from the way the ASCS office had printed the names. In this way the office disregarded the possibility that the office itself could have made a mistake in spelling or proper name of the voter; and the office penalized innocent voters who were signing their names properly.

6. The county committee would not open or count any of the ballots of people whose signature they had on record who had printed rather than signed their name. Since a signature could only be required in order to avoid fraud, it seems that before totally disregarding a printed ballot the committee should make an effort to see if fraud was involved by checking with the voters in question and finding out if indeed that voter had printed instead of written his signature.

All of these complaints must, of course, refer to the manner in which Negro voters were treated, for we have little access to information about white people involved in this election. Considering the past history of the Holmes County ASCS office and its extreme discrimination against the Negro farm owners, operators, and tenants, especially regarding participation in these important elections (see the lengthy report submitted in December 1964 concerning last year's election), we strongly suspect that the whites were treated in an altogether different manner than the Negro. However, unless a thorough and objective investigation is made, this can only remain a suspicion. We strongly urge, and, in fact, demand an investigation of the elections as they were handled in Holmes County, Miss.

Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

RALTHUS HAYES,
*Chairman, Holmes County Freedom
Democratic Party.*

LEXINGTON, MISS.,
December 11, 1965.

Mr. RAY FITZGERALD,
*Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: As I indicated in my December 8 letter to you, I am sending you our more complete report of complaints against the conduct of the ASCS community committee elections here in Holmes County, Miss. Enclosed herein you will find a 7-page report.

Additionally, there is included a 3-page "tentative appendix" to be read as footnotes to the report. It is titled "Tentative" because most of the lists of names and statements are not present within it. However, all that are requested can be easily made available.

We are most anxious to supply this evidence indicated and help in any way possible with your investigation of the matter.

Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

RALTHUS HAYES,
*Chairman, Holmes County Freedom
Democratic Party.*

ASCs ELECTIONS, ISSAQUENA COUNTY, MISS.,
1965

It seems that the ASCS office in Issaquena County made a greater effort this year to run the elections fairly. However, there were some things that they failed to do.

For example, they made no apparent effort to see that white landowners report the

names of their sharecroppers and tenants to the ASCS office. Therefore, the only sharecroppers and tenants who received ballots were those who went into the ASCS office last year at election time to ask for ballots (these people live on James Rife Wade's plantation. Mr. Wade was on the County ASCS committee last year and was elected to the community committee B in this 1965 election) and those like Mr. Louis Robinson, who is a sharecropper on Mr. J. W. Whitfield's (colored) land. Mr. Robinson wanted to run in the election and was able to qualify only after going with Mr. Whitfield into the ASCS office where he was identified as an eligible voter. One man living on the Grace Plantation was afraid to ask for a ballot because he believed his bossman, Mr. Hall Griffin, would not pay him for his crop.

Mr. Roosevelt Sias, who ran in the election last year, would not run again because his insurance company, the FHA office, the seed stores, etc., are all making it impossible for him to operate his farm by deliberately refusing to cooperate with him. Mr. Sias has children in the integrated school and his family is active in the civil rights movement.

Mr. Rufus Hurns, who submitted a petition to run in community A, was visited by Issaquena County Sheriff John A. Darnell who told him it would be best for him to change his mind about running. Mr. Hurns went into the ASCS office and had his name taken off the ballot.

The ASCS office did write letters to some people who turned in petitions telling them why they were ineligible to run. They also allowed workers to copy their list of eligible ASCS voters.

After November 12, the deadline for turning in petitions, Mr. Hall Griffin (white, lives in community B but is not on the community or county committee) came to Mr. L. Z. Dorsey, a Negro candidate in community B. He had six papers which he asked Mr. Dorsey to deliver to each of the six Negro candidates. He wanted the papers signed by the candidates and said he'd be back to get them. The papers said, in brief, that the candidate would be willing to serve as committeeman if elected and that he would be willing to settle a tie vote by lot. The candidates decided they were not willing to sign this paper, two of them went to the ASCS office to say so, and Mr. Jack Vance (county agent) said to never mind about the papers. A few days later Mr. Vance came to the three other candidates in community B with the same paper and allowed the candidates to change the wording to, "I am not willing to settle a tie vote by lot." The candidates signed after this change was made.

When the ballots came out, there were only five white names on each community's ballot so that it was impossible for white farmers to split their vote. Every ballot had more than five Negro names. In community C only one Negro candidate on the ballot was acceptable to the members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, so there was a write-in campaign using the names of two more farmers who said they would be willing to run.

On November 27, Molly Hagen's (white FDP volunteer working on ASCS elections) car was overturned while parked in Mayersville, the county seat. Three hundred dollars' worth of damage was done to the car. On November 29, the home of Mrs. Fannie Green burned to the ground. There was no obvious cause for the fire. Mrs. Green had attempted to run in the ASCS election but was not qualified.

A number of Negroes, mostly wives of landowners, requested ballots at the ASCS office because they didn't receive them in the mail. These ballots were usually marked "challenged ballot." Mrs. Violet Lawler, chief clerk in the ASCS office, said these ballots were counted only if the voter's name

was on the deed to her husband's land or if there was record of her having an interest in the 1965 crop. Each voter whose ballot was eliminated in this way received a letter from the ASCS office, but the ASCS office will not make a list of these names available.

Negroes were allowed to watch the ballot counting. As each ballot was counted, the name of the voter was read out loud. It was also stated at that time whether or not the ballot qualified. The ASCS office reports that the day after the ballot counting they received directions from ASCS in Washington, D.C., that envelopes signed by the voter with an X could not be counted if the witness had not signed the voter's name after the X. The Issaquena County ASCS office sent out registered letters to each voter whose envelope was not marked in this way, telling him that he had 5 days in which to come into the office to clear this up. This kind of a request is a great inconvenience for most Negro farmers who have little money to pay for gas or who possibly don't have a car or truck that runs. Some of them would have to travel as far as 70 miles to fill this request. Fifteen Negro votes were lost because of this unfortunate last-minute change on the part of the Washington ASCS.

No Negro farmers won positions on community committees in Issaquena County. The number of votes received by each candidate is not available. Mrs. Violet Lawler says these records are "locked up" but whites won "by a large majority in every case." The Negro population of Issaquena County is 67 percent.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague [Mr. RESNICK] for taking this special hour today to direct the attention of the House of Representatives to the serious situation developing in Mississippi among rural Negro farmworkers who are being evicted from the plantations. A situation approaching disaster proportions is confronting thousands of families. There are people without homes, without land, without sufficient food or clothing, with no jobs to look forward to and no place to go. If all of this had happened as a result of a natural disaster, a flood or tornado, the Federal Government would be quick to send in relief. We would set up temporary shelters and we would feed the people, give them clothes and a place to sleep until a more substantial and long-range solution could be worked out.

I suggest that we should be at least as compassionate with the victims of this manmade disaster.

The New York Times of February 6, carried a story by Gene Roberts, entitled "Delta Area of Mississippi in Turmoil." He visited some of the people who are not so bad off as some—they have not been evicted as yet. Here are his words:

Three nights ago at an unpainted cabin in rural Bolivar County, 40 miles from Greenville, Dave Rockemore, his wife, an 81-year-old aunt, a daughter-in-law, five children and two grandchildren sat around their wood-burning heater before retiring for the night in the cabin's three beds.

They had just finished their supper of pork neckbone, water, syrup and "flour bread," and were eager to talk of their lives and "tell it the way it is."

"The boss man told me in November we could stay on in this house free," said Mr. Rockemore, who is 55, "but he says there won't be anything for anyone in the family to do on the farm but me, and that'll be a mighty little bit."

"There won't be as much cotton planted this year," Mr. Rockemore continued, "and the boss says he's broke and needs to use chemicals on the weeds this year instead of cotton choppers. I ain't had a single day of work since the first day of November and now there ain't any hope for spring."

Mr. Maples left his sitting room, which was crowded by 12 children and grandchildren, a bed and a pot-bellied stove, and walked outside. There, he said that he had had "nary a day of work" since the first of January.

Joe Smith, 72, walked over from a neighboring cabin and observed that what Mr. Maples said also applied to him. As Mr. Smith talked, he kicked up the muddy earth with his shoes. His left shoe was a black wing-tipped design. His right one plain and brown.

The people described above are not the worst off, for the plantation owners have not forced them off the land. But they are barely a step removed from destitution.

The situation is becoming so desperate that we cannot wait on such long-range programs as retraining and resettlement, necessary as these are for the future. I respectfully suggest that a crash program to provide relief for the human suffering in the Mississippi Delta region be launched at once, coordinated by the Rural Community Development Service of the Department of Agriculture which was established last year to assist other agencies in extending their services. I do not know whether unused defense facilities can be made available, but something of this nature ought to be done. The Tent City established by the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches cannot be expected to cope with all of the families who are going to need help in the months ahead. Surplus food commodities must be distributed and we cannot permit local authorities to delay and frustrate this program any longer.

The coming of spring offers no consolation for it is reliably estimated that 6,500 fewer tractor drivers will be hired this year than last in the Delta region and it is expected that cotton-chopping jobs will be off 50 percent.

I am aware that present farm legislation is inadequate to help these people in the long haul. Most of our agricultural programs designed to help the poor farmer are available only to the farmer who already has some land and a reasonable possibility of developing a sustaining farm. We are confronted here with people who have eked out a living, such as it was, on \$3 per 10-hour day chopping cotton, and then only during the season. Chemical weed controls and farm automation are taking their jobs. They do not even have 40 acres and a mule.

The President recognizes how serious the problem of rural poverty is to our Nation. He stated in his economic report that he intends to appoint a Commission on Rural Poverty to make recommendations within 1 year of its appointment on the "most efficient and promising means of sharing America's

abundance with those who have too often been forgotten people." He has called for parity of opportunity for rural America and established the Rural Community Development Service of the Agriculture Department. I am sure new approaches are now being considered by the administration to tackle the deepening distress of our rural citizens. It may be that some sort of a new homestead proposal is needed, combined with job retraining and basic education. Whatever the long-range answers are, there is a crisis now, and I urge that we deal with it as a crisis now. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the plans now being made in Hawaii for dealing with the plight of the farmer in Vietnam. I would suggest, however, that the plight of the Negroes in the Delta counties of Mississippi is equally tragic.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I merely wish to make a brief observation if I may.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the gentleman's remarks. After listening to him, I came to this conclusion, with all due deference to him: No. 1, his speech demonstrates to me that the gentleman is, as I learned for the first time, a Member of this House. Second, his speech shows a total ignorance of the situation that exists in my great State. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. RYAN. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] for having taken this time to outline the facts which should be clear to those who want to see. They have been fully recorded in the press. We are dealing, as the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] stated, with a crisis situation which demands crash programs.

The civil rights revolution culminated in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation, these laws established equality in places of public accommodation and equality at the ballot box. Unfortunately and tragically, there is no equality at the bread box. Unfortunately and tragically the reality of equality for all our citizens has yet to be achieved. We are confronted throughout Mississippi today with the result of years and years of accumulated ills which derive from a planned pattern of discrimination and a determined effort to deny to the Negro citizens of that State their just, and their due, human rights.

We know, however, that laws are not enough to insure for all of our citizens in this great country a decent life. We know that President Johnson has called for war on poverty, and Congress has responded. There is now a national concern about poverty.

We must translate into action the concern we have expressed in legislation.

We must engage fully, wholeheartedly, with total commitment in the struggle

for human rights, the struggle for a decent home for every citizen, for food for every citizen and his family, and for jobs.

I do not think that it is any secret that millions of Americans today live in poverty, nor is it any secret that many of the poorest citizens of our land live in one of the most impoverished of our States.—that is, the State of Mississippi.

At one time it was a rich rural agricultural area, but in recent years the role of agriculture and the role of hand labor in our economy has changed. The rural areas of Mississippi have, in effect, become a slum. People who once were slaves and then tenant farmers have found that our economy has an economic rung which is even lower.

They have lost their jobs, and now they have lost their homes.

I think all of us who represent urban areas are fully familiar with the problem. The victims of the rural slums, the victims of this disaster, have moved north and west—to New York, to Chicago, and to Los Angeles. A study by Mississippi State University has shown that some 114,460 Negroes left the State in the 1950's from 11 delta counties alone. Many of them now live in the city of New York, and New York is proud that they are now her citizens. But the depressing fact is that, until we have massive programs in our cities, our cities cannot absorb this overwhelming immigration. Nobody knows this better than the recent arrivals who find themselves in the midst of the northern slums.

The problems of Mississippi are national problems. There is a clear connection between what happens in the South and what happens in the North. These problems are a vital concern to this body. They are a responsibility to which we must address ourselves.

It is important that we focus the attention of the House on this problem today.

Our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. EDWARDS] referred earlier to the New York Times article on Monday which pointed up the plight of the Negro citizen in Mississippi. One of the citizens, when interviewed, Sam Watts, spoke for 16 Negroes who were huddled around a coal-burning stove in a dim cafe, "We can't buy nothing. There ain't one of us that's hit a lick of work since before January. The white man got all the jobs."

Probably Sam Watts does not fully understand why he has no job. But his unemployment today and that of tens of thousands in similar circumstances can be explained.

During the past 5 years, cotton farming in Mississippi has been mechanized rapidly; the percentage of the State's cotton crop picked by machine rose from 42 to 62 percent between the 1960 and 1964 crop years. The major impetus for this change was the perfection and introduction, with Federal sponsorship of pre- and post-emergent herbicides, a development which almost overnight made the handchopping of cotton weeds a higher cost method of eliminating them. With this development the residual value of hand labor for cotton harvesting also dropped, as the annual cost of maintain-

ing farm families for cottonpicking outweighed the cost of shifting to machinery for the same purpose.

The modernization of Mississippi's cotton industry has increased the State's total yield from 1,542,000 bales in 1960 to 2,240,000 bales in 1964 at a time when there is weakness in the commodity market. The Government administered programs which have reduced output have had a very drastic impact.

Following the cotton referendum held in November 1965, planters are being offered in the 1966 crop year a sliding scale of diversion payments as an incentive to curb their plantings by 12.5 to 35 percent. Since the restriction reaches plantings, not marketings, the 1966 program gives an incentive to those growers not fully modernized to make a larger cut, take the adjustment payment, and convert it into machines, herbicides and fertilizers. It has been clear from the day of the referendum that a large proportion of those planting in the delta will do just this.

The gross effects of this year's acreage reduction have been anticipated and documented. The unemployment which will result has been set forth by the Mississippi State Employment Security Commission, which has projected that there will be a 50-percent drop in job openings for cotton choppers from the level of the crop year 1965.

Among tractor drivers, who hold what might be called automated jobs in the cotton fields, employment opportunities are expected to drop 25 percent. In 1964 there were some 200,000 in Mississippi's agricultural labor force. It has been estimated that between 20,000 and 70,000 of those seeking or holding jobs in cotton last year will be without work this year. That is what has brought this situation to a head in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, last week we witnessed the spectacle in the newspapers and on television of the forced eviction from Greenville Air Force Base of a number of desperate people who were seeking only shelter and the opportunity to make clear to the public their plight. At that time I urged through telegrams the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to take immediate action to deal with this emergency. I urged that there be immediate steps taken to provide for the distribution of food through the Federal Government, superseding any local administration which was unwilling to cooperate in the Federal food distribution program; and, also, that the use of Federal property, such as the Greenville Air Force Base and other Federal installations, be made available for emergency housing. I urged the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to institute a crash program of housing, food, and job training.

Housing indeed is a paramount problem facing those citizens in Mississippi today. Their housing problem illustrates the failure of the Federal Government to develop a long-range, comprehensive housing program for people who have no cash income or little cash income. We have a low-income housing

program, but public housing, mainly developed in our cities, requires an income for rent payments. There are thousands of people, those being displaced on the plantations of Mississippi are only an example, who do not have the cash income to pay rent or purchase housing. So we must develop a long-range, comprehensive housing program for them. Handing over Air Force barracks, although it might be a stopgap measure, certainly is not the solution.

In terms of housing there are now steps being taken by a privately sponsored group which point the way toward what can be done. In Tribbett, Miss., at a place called Strike City, there is a mutual self-help housing project for non- and low-income people. It is being built by the Neighborhood Developers, Inc. It is a plan to begin to deal with the forced eviction of tenant farmers, sharecroppers, and day laborers, from the cotton plantations of Mississippi. The workers involved will be building their own homes and begin to face the responsibilities and benefits of home ownership and also begin to be able to identify with community life.

This could be a pilot project which would set an example for the future. This program financed by private sources will begin by building eight houses. The Federal Government would do well to encourage this kind of development, seizing upon this project as a demonstration project which could pave the way for an imaginative new towns development program and the creation of whole new communities.

I propose a massive self-help housing program beginning now in that area of Mississippi where the need is so desperate.

Along with housing, there must be long-range programs for training and education if the citizens of Mississippi are to compete in the job market. There must be programs which will also bring in industry to provide jobs for which people are trained. This is the kind of approach that must be taken to deal with this problem on a meaningful basis.

Mr. Speaker, where people are homeless, starving, and desperate, it is up to us to recognize our responsibility. It is up to us as Members of Congress, whether we come from the North, the South, the East, or the West, to put first things first and to put human rights above every other consideration.

Again let me say I think it is fruitful that we are having this discussion this afternoon. The colloquy which has already taken place will help bring the spotlight of public attention on the crying and desperate conditions which demand immediate action by the Federal Government.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from New York for his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RESNICK. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following this

special order and any other regular special orders heretofore entered I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour, and I suggest that the gentleman from New York might hang around and get a little enlightenment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the gentlemen from Mississippi, and all of my distinguished colleagues, can cast as many aspersions as they want upon by inexperience in this House, my political beliefs, or my motivation, but the fact still remains that there is no food on the tables of the hungry Negroes of the Mississippi Delta.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate my colleague from New York [Mr. RESNICK] for taking this time to discuss the desperate plight of so many Negro Americans in Mississippi. This is not the first time he has done that. Since Congressman RESNICK entered the House a year ago he has repeatedly demonstrated his heartfelt concern for those suffering from extreme poverty and discrimination anywhere in our country. He has recently visited Mississippi at his own expense to gain insight into the problems that are being discussed here today. I think he has made some very valuable contributions toward solving this problem. Today Congressman RESNICK is leading those of us who are concerned over both the slow and ineffective distribution of free Federal food in Mississippi this winter and particularly the situation in Greenville, Miss.

Last week a number of homeless, helpless, and hungry people were evicted by military police from the Greenville, Miss., Air Force Base where they had gone hoping for food and shelter. It is interesting to note that some of these military police were flown in from as far away as Denver, Colo. It was certainly not in the interest of our national policy to fight poverty and discrimination and to aid the distressed to force these people to leave the base, without some real effort being made to respond to their plea for help.

It is now planned to hand over this Federal facility to the city of Greenville which has almost without exception demonstrated a lack of any concern whatsoever for their poverty-stricken citizens and has consistently practiced racial discrimination against Negro Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Operation Help, a Federal program designed to provide food during the winter to the poor in Mississippi, has not started distributing food

to those actually in need, although we are halfway into an unusually severe winter when this food can mean the difference between starvation and subsistence for many of those families.

Mr. Speaker, this delay is caused, and was caused, by the lack of guarantees acceptable to the Office of Economic Opportunity that the food would be distributed without racial discrimination. Others of my colleagues will explain in detail how all these various situations developed.

However, Mr. Speaker, something has just come to my attention which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. I would like to read a short news bulletin which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. Let me first state that my staff has checked the accuracy of the following news bulletin with the Department of Agriculture, and their representative in Greenville has confirmed the accuracy of this report.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

NO FREE FOOD

GREENVILLE, MISS.—The Washington County supervisors have ruled against the county taking part in a new Operation Help set up by the State and the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity to feed thousands of poor who do not benefit from Mississippi's surplus food distribution.

OEO had allotted \$24 million worth of food which was to have been distributed by the State welfare department through its county units. The Washington County supervisors rejected the program in closed session, and one supervisor said later that landowners oppose the program because it would provide free food until June and make it difficult to hire spring labor.

The State's delay in handling the free food program was behind the recent Negro live-in at decommissioned Greenville Air Force Base. Air police finally removed them.

I think, my friends and colleagues, that certainly this precipitous action on the part of the Washington County Board of Supervisors in refusing to allow free Federal food to be distributed to their poor, without any expense to the county whatever, is one of the most cruel and heartless acts, whatever the reason.

But for the county officials to refuse to give free food to these near-starving Americans because they fear that some of them would then refuse the outrageously low wages of 30 cents to 40 cents an hour during spring plowing is really one of the most ruthless acts that has ever been exhibited by governmental officials even in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action is nothing more than a realistic demonstration that the local government in Greenville, Miss., helps the landowners extort the greatest amount of money from their Negro residents.

On Saturday, I sent letters to the President of the United States and the heads of all the relevant governmental agencies concerning the problems in Mississippi that have been discussed today. I again want to particularly call for the Federal Government to immediately take over the food distribution programs in all those Mississippi counties where there is no guarantee that the local authorities will distribute the food quickly and in a nondiscriminatory manner.

However, the problems in Mississippi do not end by solving this question of the distribution of free Federal food. Mississippi has a great many problems, all related to the widespread poverty of so many of her citizens—as do a great many States in this country. The poverty program in Mississippi has operated with slow starts and quick stops—as has the poverty programs in so many other parts of the country. I urge my colleagues to diligently monitor the welfare and antipoverty programs throughout the country. And where they are inadequate we in the Congress of the United States must insure that these programs have adequate funds and proper administration.

I know that only if we in the Congress continue and redouble our efforts to apply the principles of democracy to all our people will we ever achieve the American dream of justice for all. Justice is everyone's business but it is particularly the responsibility of Members of this House. Wherever in America there are hungry people, needy people, or homeless people—regardless of the color of their skins, their ethnic origins, or the language they speak—then we in Congress are responsible.

I cannot see where our welfare—where the welfare of these Americans has been given any real consideration in the course of the actions I have reported to the Members of the House. Again I hope that we in the Congress will begin to join in this dialog, to do justice to all our people and to apply the principles of democracy to all our people, and particularly with reference to the subject matter now being discussed on the floor of this House; namely, the spending of millions of dollars of Federal funds that are coming into the State of Mississippi.

The following is the text of the letter sent to President Johnson on Saturday, February 5, 1966 by me regarding the eviction of 70 homeless members of Negro sharecropper families from the Greenville, Miss., Air Force Base earlier this week. The letter also discusses the great delay in starting Operation Help in Mississippi. I sent similar letters to the heads of all the involved Federal agencies: Secretary of Defense McNamara, Attorney General Katzenbach, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity Sargent Shriver.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The effort of 70 hungry, homeless and helpless men, women, and children to find shelter on the deactivated Greenville Air Force Base on Monday was just an illustration of the fact that there are thousands of desperate people in Mississippi this winter. The Delta Ministry, an affiliate of the National Council of Churches, estimates that more than 10,000 people will be evicted from the land by the end of the winter as a result of the effort by these sharecroppers and tenant farmers to gain decent wages and working conditions. But certainly it was heartless to force these 70 people to leave the base without any effort being made to respond to their plea for help. I feel certain that this would not have happened if the decision had not been made in such a hurry and by just the local officials.

This deactivated base is scheduled to soon become part of the Great Society's war on poverty as a manpower retraining facility. During the interim would it not be appropriate for this vacant facility to be used as a temporary housing and food distribution center until more permanent help can be found for these people? Some 200 of those who were hoping to find shelter on the base are now living in tents near Tribbett. They have asked for work and could possibly be of help in converting the base to use as a job retraining center.

Operation Help, if quickly put into effect and fairly run, could be of great help in alleviating some of the general distress in Mississippi. The main reason which prompted the Office of Economic Opportunity to originally approve this project is still valid: the very limited, and in some cases the complete lack of participation by Mississippi counties in the regular surplus commodities and food stamp program of the Federal Government. The almost \$1 million provided for salaries by the OEO administrative grant could be spent to provide jobs for some of the people we are trying to supply with nominal amounts of food. Maximum feasible participation of the poor in the poverty program would certainly suggest the hiring of some of the affected people in the food distribution program.

The original period of the program is already half over and we are well into an unusually severe winter when this food can mean the difference between starvation and subsistence for many families. The shipment of food into the States began only this week and the Agriculture Department estimates it will take yet another 5 to 10 days for the food to actually reach the poor—and in 5 counties between 45 and 60 days. I urge that Operation Help be expedited in every way and the jobs in the distribution program be given to the people when the program is designed to help.

Of course, the reason for the great delay in this program has been the lack of adequate guarantees by the Mississippi State Welfare Department and various county welfare departments that there will be no racial discrimination in the distribution of the food. The Office of Economic Opportunity was particularly concerned about this because in the past the State and county welfare departments have been flagrantly discriminatory in both their hiring of personnel and also in their distribution of Federal funds and food. All of the organizations in Mississippi most active in the civil rights and antipoverty efforts, such as the Mississippi State Conference of the NAACP, the Delta Ministry, and the Mississippi Freedom Labor Union, have urged OEO to even now withhold the funds. However, this week OEO announced that they were proceeding with Operation Help because of the urgent need even though the assurances are still not adequate.

The matter is certainly most urgent, but the Federal Government cannot allow Mississippi to use the plight of its citizens to block the enforcement of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which specifically prohibits racial discrimination in the use of Federal funds. Certainly a solution to this dilemma would be for the Federal Government itself to distribute the food in those counties where neither the county nor the State government will guarantee fairness in running the program.

As a result of your leadership and initiative the Federal Government has always come to the aid of victims of natural disasters. I particularly recall the speedy and effective aid given to the victims of Hurricane Betsy last fall in the Gulf Coast States, including Mississippi. You took personal charge of this emergency by flying to the affected areas and ordering all appropriate agencies, in-

cluding the Defense Department, to provide every form of assistance possible and by also immediately declaring the affected States as natural disaster areas. I urge you to similarly order all appropriate Federal agencies to rush assistance to the hungry, homeless and helpless people in Mississippi who are as much helpless victims as are the victims of an earthquake, flood or hurricane.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Member of Congress.

The following is a letter from the heads of the Mississippi State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People concerning the lack of adequate guarantees by Mississippi that Operation Headstart would be administered in a non-discriminatory manner:

FEBRUARY 2, 1966.

MR. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.
MR. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: It has come to our attention that the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Agriculture have joined in a program of food distribution with the department of welfare of the State of Mississippi. While we support the activity of making food available to hungry citizens of our State, we must genuinely state our objections to how this was done. Your office was fully aware of the following conditions before the program was entered into.

The department of welfare for the State of Mississippi is notorious for its discrimination against Negro citizens, particularly in the area of employment; fewer than six Negroes are employed in any capacity throughout this State agency.

When we called the question of employment to the attention of the department of welfare, we were informed that the county board of supervisors were responsible for the persons hired, and hence the department of welfare could not guarantee that Negroes would not be continuously discriminated against in this program. When this question was raised before the county board of supervisors of Coahoma County, Miss., the board of supervisors disclaimed all responsibility in the hiring of persons for the county welfare department. Thus, neither agency assumed responsibility for employment discrimination in the county.

In light of the history of the State department of welfare, we asked that when the committee to administer the program was selected, that the Negro community would have the opportunity to participate in the selection of at least one of the members. We knew also, of the desire of Gov. Paul B. Johnson to have the final say in the selection of the committee to select those whites and Negroes who would be of a benefit to him politically; the Negro community was not permitted to participate in the selection of not one on this committee.

Thus, the program began with the ingredients that have fostered segregation and discrimination against the Negro community in the past still intact.

It is difficult for us to understand just how you would lend your good names and the names of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Economic Opportunity to this bizarre scheme.

However, now that it has been done, we request that all funds be withheld from this program until a thorough investigation has been conducted.

We would like to be assured that in the future, when programs come with these kind of built-in discrepancies, that more effort

be made by you and your staffs to correct them before firm agreements are reached.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EVERS,
Field Director, NAACP.
AARON E. HENRY,
President, Mississippi State Conference,
NAACP.

cc:

Mr. Clarence Mitchell.
Congressman CHARLES DIGGS.
Congressman JOHN CONYERS.
Congressman ADAM C. POWELL.
Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.
Mr. Richard Housler.
Mr. Sam Yette.
Mr. Theodore Berry.

The following newspaper articles give the details regarding the recent attempt of 70 people to find shelter on the Greenville, Miss., Air Force base:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1966]
THIRTY-FIVE HUNGRY NEGROES INVADE ABANDONED AIR FORCE BASE

GREENVILLE, MISS., Jan. 31.—A group of Negroes invaded the deactivated Greenville Air Force Base today saying, "We are here because we are hungry and cold and we have no jobs or land."

They brought blankets and clothing—but no food—and moved into an unheated wooden building near the main gate.

Law enforcement officers ringed the area but took no action when they couldn't decide who had jurisdiction—city, county, or Federal authorities.

Officers said there were about 35 persons inside the one-story building. A civil rights spokesman said there were 51.

"We don't want charity," said the Negroes in a statement released by civil rights groups. "We are willing to work for ourselves if given a chance."

The Negroes identified themselves as "the Poor People's Conference."

They marched through the main gate after sunrise and caught base guards by surprise. There was still snow on the ground from a record cold spell over the weekend and at midday temperatures remained near freezing.

AN ADVANCE PARTY

A spokesman for one civil rights group said the Negroes were an advance party of hundreds of delta area laborers who would move onto the base. But the spokesman admitted that more Negroes might not be able to join the first group because of lawmen ringing the area.

The spokesman said efforts would be made to take food to the group.

Another spokesman, Mimi Shaw, an official of the National Council of Churches' Delta Ministry, said the Negroes moved on the base "to stay until their demands were met. I don't think they will be talked off."

The Air Force ended operations on the base last March but still maintains control with Lt. Col. George B. Andrews having charge of 27 civilians. There was no comment from Andrews.

The Poor People's Conference statement said:

"We are at the Greenville Air Force Base because it is Federal property and there are hundreds of empty houses and buildings. We need those houses and the land. We could be trained for jobs in the buildings."

The statement asked President Johnson: "Whose side are you on, the poor people or the millionaires?"

It also charged that Federal commodities distributed to the needy were "old and full of bugs and weevils." The Negroes asked for fresh vegetables, fruits, and meats, saying, "We want to decide what foods we want to eat."

NOT REPRESENTED

Additionally, the Poor People's Conference, which said it is connected with the Delta Ministry and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, also demanded that antipoverty programs be taken out of the hands of county supervisors because "they don't represent us."

"We want the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire poor people we say represent us. We, the poor people, want to distribute the food."

Police wouldn't let newsmen enter the building where the Negroes were camping. They said it would be a violation of the law—apparently trespassing.

Asked why the jurisdiction question arose, one policeman said, "It's city property on a Government reservation in the county."

The city of Greenville owns all of the base except 13 acres. The land was leased to the Federal Government, which has leased a portion back to the city for use as an airport and for a training school.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1966]

SIXTY SQUATTERS REMOVED FROM ABANDONED BASE

GREENVILLE, Miss., February 1.—The Air Force tossed a group of Negro squatters and civil rights workers off its deactivated base here today some 30 hours after they moved into an empty building, demanding food, jobs, and land.

Before the squatters were expelled, however, a Federal spokesman promised that antipoverty aid to Mississippi would be speeded up.

The Negroes set out on a march to Greenville, 4 miles away. They were convoyed by highway patrol cars at front and rear.

One woman, identified as Susie Tyler, 40, was arrested by county officers on a charge of profane language.

The crowd, led by civil rights workers, rushed past the base gate guard yesterday and took possession of a building. They said they were homeless. They demanded quick antipoverty aid, job training, and land.

The Air Force brought in 150 air police from several bases to handle the ejection. About 30 Negroes, mainly elderly and children, walked out of the building. The other 60—including some white civil rights workers—were lugged out, one by one, and marched off the base. They were released after they left Federal property.

Maj. Gen. R. W. Puryear, commanding the air police, ordered the squatters ejected after Unita Blackwell, an official of the Freedom Democratic Party, told him:

"The group unanimously voted to stay."

General Puryear and James Turner, a Department of Justice lawyer, had both tried to talk the squatters off the base.

"If any of you are really homeless we will see what can be done," said Turner.

Turner said Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman realizes that Operation Help has been delayed in Mississippi and will move to expedite the program.

Mrs. Blackwell said most of the Negroes involved had been forced off nearby cotton plantations, where a farmhand strike was called in an effort to force higher wages.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 2, 1966]

RIGHTS SQUATTERS EVICTED, LEADERS ASSAIL U.S. ACTION

GREENVILLE, Miss.—Leaders of a group that staged a 30-hour occupation of Federal property accused the Federal Government today of kowtowing to Mississippi politicians over antipoverty programs for Negroes.

In Washington, the Office of Economic Opportunity issued a statement last night which said a team of specialists would confer with Mississippi Gov. Paul Johnson to "assure

rapid distribution of food under terms of the antipoverty grant."

The department said a grant of \$1.6 million had been approved with the Mississippi Welfare Department to develop a system of distribution for \$24 million of surplus food.

KOWTOWING CHARGE

Art Thomas, director of the Delta Ministry, said "the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Agriculture have been kowtowing to Mississippi politicians who don't want poverty or relief programs in the hands of Negroes who can't be controlled by the white power structure."

The Delta Ministry is an arm of the National Council of Churches set up to work among southern Negroes.

Thomas, along with a biracial group of 80 other demonstrators, was ejected from a former cadets' club on the deactivated Greenville Air Force Base yesterday. A detail of 150 air police carried out the demonstrators, who had bolted past guards Monday and camped overnight in the wooden frame structure.

The demonstrators included Negroes who said they were ousted from white plantations after demanding higher wages, and civil rights workers. All said the base invasion was sponsored by the "Poor People's Conference." They said they wanted food, jobs, and land.

Thomas said "it was cruel and inhumane of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach to send the message that was sent." He referred to the order which ousted them, and to Federal promises that their demands were being studied.

Most of the demonstrators who took part in "drive-in" at the base now are housed in a 5-acre tent city near here.

Air police carried out most of the group, but elderly members and children walked out when the police closed in.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 2, 1966]

ANTIPOVERTY PLAN STALLED MONTHS IN MISSISSIPPI

(By Robert Walters)

A \$1.6 million antipoverty program that might have prevented yesterday's clash between Mississippi Negroes and Air Force police has been bottled up for more than 5 months.

The program was submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity and Agriculture Department last August and formally approved by the two agencies on November 30.

The funds, to finance distribution of \$24 million in surplus food to needy Mississippians, should have been released more than 2 months ago but were tied up because of a lengthy dispute between Federal and State officials.

A tentative agreement was reached last weekend and the food distribution project, known as Operation Help, should get underway this week, an OEO official said yesterday.

But the program was designed to assist impoverished Negroes survive a winter which is now almost half over.

NINE CURBS ON PROGRAM

Moreover, the program already has failed to attain one of its most important goals: To show that Mississippi can comply with the Federal antipoverty agency's civil rights standards.

At the heart of the Federal-State dispute are nine unusual restrictions, incorporated in the program because OEO officials feared the Mississippi Welfare Department might run the project on a discriminatory basis.

OEO reserved the right last November to withhold \$400,000 until all of the conditions were met. One called for establishment of

a biracial statewide advisory committee to oversee the program.

Rather than release the other \$1.2 million immediately, OEO waited for formation of the advisory committee as an indicator of Mississippi's intentions to comply with the civil rights standards.

Most of the other special conditions could not be met until after program was underway. They included nondiscrimination in the hiring of 470 local poor persons to run the program and completely integrated food distribution lines.

OEO was technically in violation of the contract, which called for withholding only \$400,000, but Federal antipoverty officials feared they would lose virtually all control if the bulk of the funds was released.

FINALLY AGREED

After weeks of negotiating, Federal and State officials agreed on an advisory board composed of five white and four Negroes. Last Sunday, only 1 day before 30 Negroes marched unannounced into the deactivated Greenville Air Force Base, OEO agreed to release "part of the funds."

The Federal agency's announcement yesterday did not specify the amount. It did say that a team of specialists from OEO and Agriculture "will fly to Jackson, Miss., immediately to accelerate the food distribution."

The announcement also indicated that OEO still is not completely satisfied with the composition of the advisory committee: "OEO believes the advisory committee * * * can assist in making this program a success and that it will be broadened. OEO must, however, assume its basic obligation to assure that the program is operated within terms of the grant."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1966]

BISHOP MOORE FEARS TROUBLE IN MISSISSIPPI

(By Richard Corrigan)

"It's one thing to sit up here and talk," the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., said yesterday, "but when you see the people out in the cold and the snow, with no work and nothing to eat, it's very different."

Bishop Moore, Suffragan Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, has just returned from a weekend in the Mississippi Delta. Yesterday at an informal press conference in his National Cathedral office, he discussed the march of some 75 Negroes and civil rights workers onto the Greenville Air Force Base, their ejection and the implications of the incident for the South.

He believes the implications are dangerous. "I sensed a new chapter being unfolded down there * * * increasing bitterness against the Federal Government," he explained.

The delta Negroes, he said "have heard all these promises, they have worked hard * * * they have done this and they have done that * * * they have done all the things that the white folks say you should do in a calm, legal way and nothing has happened."

Now, he went on, unless Washington quickly launches a thoroughgoing program to help them, the Negroes will lose all faith in their Federal Government, just as they already have lost faith in their State and local governments.

Already, there is talk of making it on their own with no allegiance. "I feel with every bone in my body that the Federal Government just has to get with this program."

Bishop Moore is chairman of the commission in charge of the Delta Ministry, a field project of the National Council of Churches. The ministry is allied with the militant Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and the Freedom Labor Union and was involved in the January 21 march on the air force base.

The bishop said he does not know who conceived the idea of the march, which re-

sulted in the controversial expulsion of the group by Air Force police. The empty base is scheduled to become an educational and job training center, but among their demands the marchers insisted they be allowed to live there now. (Representative JOHN CONYERS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan, yesterday endorsed this demand in a letter to President Johnson.)

"Wherever the idea might have come from, it was adopted with great enthusiasm," the clergyman said. And while not condoning the action, the bishop said the important point to consider is the deep sense of frustration that led to it.

He said the Federal Government has come up with too little too late for the delta Negroes, "who are literally starving, and whose future is absolutely hopeless."

Bishop Moore said he and other representatives of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights met Thursday with Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to ask for a greater Federal effort in Mississippi. The response was discouraging, he reported.

"The Federal Government can move if it wants to," he said, but first it must decide to "buck the political forces in Mississippi" and it must "set up a total new structure down there."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. RESNICK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to ask the gentleman this. The gentleman knows that this is my area. The gentleman has made certain statements as flat fact. Most of us get our information from sources. I have read where the gentleman said he had spent 2 days or 3 days, I believe, in Mississippi, and I read where he had said with regard to the agriculture conservation program that they have run so many Negroes in so many areas, they divided the vote and caused them to lose. At that time it was said—he was asked—according to the press—as to whether he had taken the matter up with me. The gentleman said he had not—and, of course, he has not.

It is my understanding that all of these elections are under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. Does the gentleman think it is unfair to let as many Negroes run as might wish to in these cases or was the newspaper correct as to what the gentleman says.

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to answer the gentleman. The direct order from the Secretary of Agriculture Freeman instructed the local ASCS committees to have as many Negroes on the ballot—and in the same proportion as they had voters—farmers. In other words, if 50 percent of the farmers in a community were white, then 50 percent of the names on the ballot are supposed to be white and 50 percent Negro. What was done then, instead of the local ASCS committees putting on the names of 50 percent of Negroes, they put on 100 percent or 150 percent of Negroes, and split the Negro vote and preventing them from winning.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, we are conducting hearings now on the appropriations for the Department. I do not know of anything in the law or any authority of the Secretary that would enable him to put names on an election ballot. It is my understanding that the elections are voluntary.

A man would have to ask to have his own name put on the ballot. If there is any law, and the gentleman is on the Committee on Agriculture, that would give the Secretary that authority, I do not know of it. But now the gentleman's complaint is not about keeping Negroes from running but that they let too many of them run. Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. RESNICK. They did not let too many run. It was a deliberate subterfuge as a part of the conspiracies that I pointed out before, to prevent the Negro from getting what is his right in his home State. He has as much right as you, my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, to run in these ASCS elections.

Mr. WHITTEN. If I understood the gentleman, he is complaining that too many of them ran for one of them to win. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman can smell a rotten egg as well as I can.

Mr. WHITTEN. I can.

Mr. RESNICK. Now this is a complete red herring. This is a complete subterfuge. This is a complete violation of the directive from the Secretary of Agriculture.

I would like to point out, if the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi feels that the Secretary of Agriculture was wrong in issuing that directive, then let him say so.

Mr. WHITTEN. The right and wrong of it does not enter into it. I asked the gentleman if he is aware of any law that gives the Secretary that authority—I am not aware of any such law.

Mr. RESNICK. I can only assume that the Secretary has that authority if he issued that directive.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have not seen the directive. I do know the Secretary has attempted to make all these things fair at least so far as racial relations. I am aware that he has tried to do so. I think he is under certain limitations. I do not know of any authority that he has there in that respect.

May I ask the gentleman this. You know our Department of Agriculture tries to provide studies on wholesale marketing facilities and draws up plans and tries to make them available to our Nation's cities.

This fall I was in New York City. I was around the 14th Street Market. I was in the Harlem area, what you call the slum area. I was also in various schools in Detroit one of which had 1,300 students, 4 of whom, as I recall, were white. I visited and observed the school lunch programs there. I was in Chicago and visited the poorer areas in connection with the food stamp program. I did not issue any statement about those things. I never thought that I knew as much about your area as you perhaps do. But I was there when a campaign was going on and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] was a candidate. At that time he had a real awareness of the situation in Harlem and many of the areas, according to the press.

From his description they were much worse than I know the facts to be in my

area. He was promising at that time to do something about them.

I should like to make one further statement. I should like to say, in my humble opinion the gentleman is completely wrong as to the facts he has stated about my section. I grew up there. I was district attorney in that area. I will match my record on fairness to all races with anybody in the country and prove it.

I say the facts are completely opposite to what the gentleman from New York seems to have been led to believe.

The gentleman has only 3 percent Negroes in his district, according to his statement; I should like to ask this question: Do you feel that through this effort you are not setting up a strawman in Mississippi and running against him so as to avoid discussing your own problems in New York City or is the gentleman interested in trying to keep the 3 percent of Negroes in his district from becoming 8 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent?

Mr. RESNICK. I think the gentleman has asked a number of questions. I should like to answer them one at a time.

As I said in my prepared remarks, there is no question that we have problems in Detroit, New York, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., and many other Northern areas. The fact remains that Federal commodities are coming into those areas. We have food stamps, and we are doing everything in our power.

We know our problems; we are trying to solve them. No board of supervisors in the North, in my memory, has ever voted to discontinue a program of food to starving citizens. And this was done. That is a matter of record. This is not my belief; this is fact; this is record.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is aware that I am chairman of the committee that recommends funds for the food stamp program. I am chairman of the committee that recommended funds for plans for a new wholesale market in New York City, so that they could cut the cost to consumers. I am glad to say that the city is following those plans.

May I say to the gentleman that for a board of supervisors to say they would not distribute food to people who would not work or at a time when employers cannot find any one to work, is completely different from the way the gentleman has described the situation. I am sure food has been and will be distributed to needy persons, if and when this group agitating for a Federal takeover gets out.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to point out that people are hungry no matter what time of year it is. They will be hungry in April as they are hungry today. The fact remains that even in the unbusy time, during the dead of winter, no food has gone into Mississippi under either the regular food commodity program or under this Operation Help, except for these token amounts that went into the 13 counties which have the

smallest number of Negroes. This information comes from the National Council of Churches.

I would like to point out to you, Mr. WHITTEN, that on sworn testimony the National Council of Churches sent food and other commodities from the Government warehouses and attempted to distribute them at their own expense in rural communities. They were stopped by the Mississippi State Police. They were fined \$250, \$300, \$325, and charged with having improper license tags, regardless of what kind of trucks they hired. This is what the State of Mississippi is doing. They are preventing food from going to hungry people.

I will get on a plane with you tomorrow morning and I will go to Greenville and we will look at it first hand.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. May I point out with reference to the visit that my distinguished colleague has made to Detroit, which I did not know about, and I am sorry I did not, I hope that he carefully examined the city and the food plans for any evidence of racial discrimination. I certainly agree with him that there is discrimination in the North and in the South. If he finds any anywhere in Detroit, I would be perfectly delighted to explore the matter in the same way we are exploring the matter here with regard to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to say further to the gentleman from Mississippi that I will, at my expense, take you down there and any other Member of the Mississippi delegation and investigate this, and if I am a liar, I would be very happy to be proven so.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would the gentleman go with me to Harlem first?

Mr. RESNICK. Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have already been there. The point I make is that we all have problems, but the gentleman's facts are incorrect about this area.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to go to Greenville—

Mr. WHITTEN. I know the gentleman would, and I am sure the television cameras would be there as they were at the debate the other day. I am sure that that is what the gentleman seeks. I know that he seeks controversy, and what we are having here plays into his hands. By the same token, we cannot let these false charges go unanswered, because they are false.

Mr. RESNICK. Bishop Moore, who is a man of the cloth, when he first came back from Mississippi said:

There are starving Negroes there. The food is not getting through.

You talk to the people over at the Department of Agriculture. I know you have life-and-death control over the Department of Agriculture because of your position as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I support them, I do not hurt them.

Mr. RESNICK. The fact still remains that there is no food going into the eight

delta counties in spite of the work of the National Council of Churches.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true; through the choice of the organization of churches.

Mr. RESNICK. No, not through any organization. I am sorry to say to the gentleman, not through any organization.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could the gentleman supply me with information to that effect? We have had a regular food distribution program.

Mr. RESNICK. Not in the eight delta counties.

Mr. WHITTEN. According to our information, this new organization under the Council of Churches wants to take it over and to run it. That is the situation according to my information.

Mr. RESNICK. No.

Mr. WHITTEN. They would like to participate with a group which has leftist leanings and many associations and friends the gentleman does not believe in.

Mr. RESNICK. Is the gentleman from Mississippi calling the National Council of Churches a leftist organization?

Mr. WHITTEN. I say they have many associations with people who have them; and that is correct.

Mr. RESNICK. Is the gentleman from Mississippi calling the National Council of Churches a leftist organization?

Mr. WHITTEN. I said that they have many associations with people who do have. The gentleman heard me.

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman has not answered my question. The only organization which has been considered to do voluntary distribution of food is the National Council of Churches.

Mr. WHITTEN. Through its associate, the Delta Ministry.

Mr. RESNICK. The Delta Ministry is part of the National Council of Churches.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is aware of the associations and the people involved.

Mr. RESNICK. In other words, this is "guilt by association?"

Mr. WHITTEN. No.

Mr. RESNICK. Because they are associated.

Mr. WHITTEN. It only helps to tell what kind of people they are.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from New York [Mr. RESNICK] for securing this time to discuss the plight of the Mississippi Delta Negroes. The recent episode at the abandoned Air Force barracks in Greenville, Miss., dramatizes the desperate situation. We must bear in mind that the group of Negroes who tried to use these barracks for living quarters are but a tiny fraction of the huge number of displaced Negro farmworkers in Mississippi.

It is more than merely disheartening to witness the long delay in the distribution of food to the needy. This evidently resulted from the fact that Mississippi did not originally furnish adequate guarantees that the distribution would be made on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. We are dealing here with the essentials of life itself. In such a situ-

ation, the Federal Government should institute its own program. I cannot believe that it is more important to avoid a possible slight to the dignity of a State government than it is to provide the hungry with food.

The story of the forcible eviction of the Negroes who occupied the abandoned barracks in Mississippi brought to mind the bonus marchers of the great depression. Many of us honored President Franklin Roosevelt for sending food to the bonus marchers during his administration. This was in sharp contrast to the violent eviction of the bonus marchers from their campsites during the administration of President Hoover.

I cannot but conclude that it would have been wiser and more compassionate for the Government to have furnished food and medicines to the Greenville people while, at the same time, undertaking a comprehensive, rapid program designed to alleviate the conditions which made the protest so poignant. If the demonstrators were hungry and homeless when they engaged in the trespass, does dispossessing them answer their need for shelter and food? I find it hard to accept a situation where those who have no home are thrown out of unused housing. I find it difficult to accept a situation where surplus food is withheld from starving people while intergovernmental problems are being debated.

If the demonstrators were alienated from our society when they entered the abandoned barracks, I assume that they are even more alienated now and that many others will be similarly affected.

Are we, as my colleague has stated, creating a new kind of refugee, right within our own borders? The situation is intolerable, and strenuous Federal Government action is called for.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Negroes of Mississippi have long been a subject people. But despite the constant oppression they have remained relatively peaceful. There have been no race riots in Mississippi.

Mississippi Negroes have refrained from violence for a number of reasons. Partly it was due to apathy and acceptance of their situation. The tragedy of the theory of white racial superiority was that not only did whites believe in it, but that many Negroes accepted a false doctrine and believed themselves to be inferior.

Fear was another reason for a lack of violent protest. With the law and the economic power under the complete control of their oppressors, Mississippi Negroes felt that any uprising would be hopeless, and would result in more damage than help.

But more important was a belief among Negroes that an improvement in their status could be accomplished through peaceful, democratic change. Although they did not have much personal evidence to reinforce their belief, they felt that beneficial change could come through American institutions.

The local and State governments in Mississippi offered no hope. These governments have always been publicly committed to a segregated society and unequal treatment; their officials cam-

paigned on a platform of "segregation forever."

But our National Government was another matter. The Supreme Court declared segregation illegal. The executive branch, when directly challenged by State governments, made moves to enforce court orders. And the Congress broke a long silence by passing Voting Rights Acts in 1957, 1960, and 1965, and a Civil Rights Act in 1964.

All of these civil rights actions by the Federal Government were given much national publicity. But the promise of these court rulings and congressional actions have not reached the ordinary Negro in Mississippi.

Twelve years after the Supreme Court declared school segregation unconstitutional, much less than 1 percent of Negro schoolchildren in Mississippi attend desegregated schools.

Mississippi, which has allowed only 6 percent of its Negro adult citizens to register to vote, has Federal registrars in only 19 of its 82 counties. In no area of Mississippi do Negroes have an effective voice in the determination of their government.

How long can we expect Mississippi Negroes to rely on peaceful protests? How long can they believe that American institutions offer hope of change? How long will they wait for a Federal Government that is seemingly indifferent or unable to help with their situation?

In 1964 when they were denied participation in the traditional Democratic Party of their State, Mississippi Negroes organized a delegation to the national convention that was much more true to the principles of the Democratic Party. For their efforts, they were offered a place on the floor for only two of their members.

They are prevented from voting for their representatives in Congress by intimidation and violence. So they gathered affidavits and other evidence and presented this to Congress last year. In return they did not even receive a public hearing.

We must do something now. We must show the Negro citizens of Mississippi that we care about them, that we are ashamed that in a rich nation so many people can be without jobs, without adequate shelter, and in many cases without even enough food.

I had hoped that the local and State governments in Mississippi would try to make up for past neglect of colored citizens. Many Mississippians say that the situation is not really too bad, that they only need time to correct it. But I can find little cause for hope that the present authorities in Mississippi will produce improvements when their present record shows that they are placing every obstacle in the way to prevent food from reaching the desperate Negro people of the delta section. If they will work to prevent a simple humanitarian gesture of feeding hungry people, how can we expect the local authorities to undertake any measures that will bring significant improvement in the economic and political conditions of the Negro population?

So if change is going to come, it will have to be stimulated by Federal Government. The Justice Department should immediately send Federal registrars to more counties in Mississippi, and these registrars should have hours and locations which best serve the needs of the population. New vocational training programs should be instituted so that people whose jobs are being replaced by machinery will have some means whereby they can earn a living. Employment programs should be started to relieve the heavy unemployment and underemployment. The Agriculture Department and all other Federal agencies must act to make sure all their programs are administered in a nondiscriminatory manner. The Congress must pass laws, and these laws must be enforced, to insure that citizens seeking to exercise their basic constitutional rights are not prevented from this by violence or economic intimidation.

Mississippi Negroes have not yet protested violently. If they did resort to riots such as occurred in Watts and Harlem, everybody would be aroused. Presidential task forces would be sent to the area. Massive new Federal programs would be promised, and probably new laws would be passed.

But let us not wait for a riot; instead, let us prevent one. Let us reward people who have peacefully asked that they be granted full participation in the American democracy.

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION ON CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the recess between sessions of Congress, the United Nations adopted a resolution dealing with the future of Cyprus which I believe deserves more attention than it has received heretofore.

I can appreciate our grave preoccupation with the problem of restoring peace in Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, and this is as it should be. But America, as the leader of the world, must be able to concentrate its attention on many problem areas at one time so that if peace comes to Vietnam, hostilities will not again erupt in some other place. Cyprus is one such place which continues to be a source of world conflict.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans want peace and it is for this reason that I plead now for effective action to insure that Cyprus does not again become a battleground which could involve the entire world in conflict.

Peace and justice for Cyprus lies in America's interest. We, as the leader of the world, must recognize that what happens in Cyprus, sooner or later, affects every American.

I was pleased, therefore, to see the United Nations on December 17 in the Security Council, unanimously agree to renew the mandate of the U.N. peacekeeping force in Cyprus for a period of another 3 months.

Following that, on December 18, 1965, after a long exhaustive discussion at the First Political Committee and General Assembly, the following resolution was adopted:

The General Assembly, having considered the question of Cyprus * * * recalling the declaration adopted on October 10, 1964, by the conference of heads of state or government of nonaligned countries, held in Cairo, regarding the question of Cyprus.

Noting the report of the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus, submitted to the Secretary General on March 26, 1965.

Noting further that the Government of Cyprus is committed through its declaration of intent and memorandum to:

(a) The full application of human rights to all citizens of Cyprus, irrespective of race or religion,

(b) The insuring of minority rights.

(c) The safeguarding of the above rights as contained in the said declaration and memorandum.

1. Takes cognizance of the fact that the Republic of Cyprus, as an equal member of the United Nations, is, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, entitled to and should enjoy full sovereignty and complete independence without any foreign intervention or interference;

2. Calls upon all states, in conformity with their obligations under the charter, and in particular article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it;

3. Recommends to the Security Council the continuation of the United Nations mediation work in conformity with resolution 186 (1964).

By this resolution, which is considered to be a significant victory of reason and justice, all member-states are called upon to refrain from any intervention against Cyprus, which is thus recognized to be an equal member of the United Nations, contrary to the provisions of the Zurich and London agreements, which thus in fact cease to exist.

It is clearly apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the United States, in supporting the Security Council decision to keep the peacekeeping force in Cyprus, supports the position that the most important single factor needed in Cyprus today is stabilization of conditions on this embattled island as quickly as possible.

While we and the entire world—including two of our close allies, Greece and Turkey, who are most directly involved in the Cyprus question—must do all possible to help restore stability to Cyprus. We must not overlook the fact that the problem is essentially that of the people of Cyprus.

For Cyprus is an independent country and member of the United Nations, entitled to all the attributes of equal sovereignty under the charter, including that of self-determination. The resolution of the General Assembly on Cyprus clearly refers to these rights of the Republic of Cyprus and prohibits any foreign intervention or interference against it, while recommending the continuation of the United Nations mediation work in accordance with the respective resolution of the Security Council.

Cyprus, however, has still to solve its internal problem as between the Greek majority of 82 percent and the Turkish

minority of 18 percent. Such solution has, no doubt, to be based upon the principles of the charter and the universally accepted norms of justice and democracy.

We cannot enter into the question of what should be the solution of the problem of Cyprus—for that is a matter for the people of Cyprus. We are all agreed that there should be a peaceful solution of the problem. What, in our view, is essential, however, is that the proper climate in Cyprus is created which would render a peaceful solution possible. To that end, there should be an improvement in the relations between those primarily concerned, namely, the Cypriot people of Greek and Turkish origin.

The Secretary General in his report of December 10, 1965, on the situation in Cyprus pointed out that the prospects for a solution did not look very bright because first, the mediation work was stalled since March 1965 when the report of the Mediator was issued, because of objections filed by Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriots to the report and, more grievously, their objection to the Mediator continuing his work; and second, there appeared no significant progress toward improvement in the intercommunal relations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

It is gratifying to note that the Government of Cyprus has taken a number of steps toward easing and normalizing the situation in Cyprus by undertaking to first, repair or reconstruct Turkish houses which may have been damaged or destroyed; second, give financial assistance for the rehabilitation of all the Turkish Cypriots who have been forced by the Turkish extremist leadership to abandon their homes and villages; third, provide them with the means for the exercise of their profession or calling as well as to give financial assistance to those unable to work; and fourth, generally to take all measures for their safety and protection. I am advised that Turkish houses have been so constructed and other measures with regard to amnesty and further assistance are being contemplated.

Furthermore, as the U.N. resolution notes, the Government of Cyprus issued a Declaration of Intent on October 4, 1965, which is a legally binding document obligating it to apply in Cyprus: First, a Code of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms to be enjoyed by every person irrespective of origin, religion, language, or sex, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; second, autonomy to all minority communities with regard to matters appertaining to education, culture, religion, personal status, and other related subjects; and third, participation in Parliament of the minority communities, in accordance with the recommendation of the United Nations Mediator.

Moreover, the Government has undertaken to insure those rights by international guarantee through first, the presence in Cyprus of a United Nations Commissioner with an adequate staff of observers and advisers on such terms as the Secretary General may direct for the purpose of insuring the observance of

those rights and privileges; and second, the adoption of the appropriate machinery to that end by the Secretary General on the advice, if necessary, of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights.

These are obviously positive steps toward insuring the protection of the rights of the minorities and should be considered a constructive move toward creating an appropriate climate on Cyprus for a satisfactory solution of the problem.

It is regrettable, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Turkey apparently is not willing to help in that direction. From the U.N. record it would appear that Turkey goes out of its way to oppose any reconciliation between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots and even to exercise, through its military on the island, restrictions upon Turkish Cypriots in a persistent effort to prevent them—even by force—from resuming normal relations with their Greek compatriots. Concrete instances of this policy from the Turkish Government have been cited by the Representative of Cyprus during the discussion of the question in the Security Council on December 17 and they were apparently not denied by the Representative of Turkey who even tried to justify them.

The exchange in the U.N. between the Cypriot spokesman and the Turkish delegate should be of grave concern to all of us who want to see peace in Cyprus.

Reading from the U.N. record of December 17, 1965, we find the following statement by Mr. Zenon Rossides, permanent representative of Cyprus to the U.N.:

It is really very important to note that, in the case of Cyprus, as in other cases, although the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations have proved very useful and constructive, its peace-keeping effort has lagged behind. But there are particular circumstances in Cyprus which should be examined in connection with this delay in the solution of the problem.

I do not wish what I am going to say to be taken as criticism of any one side. But there are facts that must be taken into account in order to appraise the situation and see what can be done so that there may be a move toward a solution of the problem.

In the Secretary-General's report it is stated that the course leading to a solution of the problem is mediation by the United Nations. But if we turn to chapter V "Mediation Effort" of the report (S. 7001), we read there, in paragraph 203:

"Two of the parties concerned, the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community through its leadership, objected to certain sections of the Mediator's report, and the Government of Turkey expressed the view that, because the report contained sections which went beyond his terms of reference, Mr. Plaza's functions as a Mediator had come to an end upon the publication of his report. I could not accept this view"—the Secretary General continues—"as reported in S. 6267."

We see therefore that the mediation that was started in accordance with the resolution of March 4, 1964 has, according to the report of December 10, 1965, been stalemated. Why is there a "standstill," to use the word of the Secretary General? In paragraph 204 of his report, the Secretary General says the following:

"In these circumstances the Mediator has been unable to function,"—because of what

was stated before about Turkey's attitude—"and consequently the search for a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the Cyprus problem has been at a standstill. However, at my request, the Mediator has continued to be available to the parties for further efforts at mediation, in accordance with the provisions of the Security Council resolution of March 4, 1964."

I repeat this is not intended as criticism of anyone, but this is to show why the mediation effort has been stalemated—because of a Turkish attitude inconsistent with the views accepted by the Secretary General that the Mediator has performed his duties in accordance with his mandate. But this is not all.

There is another aspect of the problem which is mentioned in paragraph 211 of the report: " * * * no significant progress toward a solution of the basic conflict between the two communities," that is, between the Greek majority and the Turkish minority. This is another aspect of the problem which requires examination. Why has there been no improvement in those relations?

The reason why there has been no improvement is that the policy of the Turkish Cypriot leadership, obviously supported by Turkey, is to prevent any reconciliation or any move toward getting the Greek and Turkish Cypriots together. In fact, in his March 1965 report, if I am not mistaken, it is stated to the effect that it is a matter of policy for the Turkish Cypriot leadership not to allow any improvement in the relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

These two aspects of the problem are so important that the time has come for the Security Council to look into them. It is not only a matter of policy; there is far more to it than that. It goes to extremes. For instance, it was stated in one of my letters to the Secretary General that a document was given which was a leaflet, a copy of which was communicated to the Commander of UNFICYP by the Cypriot Minister for the Interior and which read as follows—this was never denied by the Turkish side and it cannot now be denied:

"Turkish Cypriots not in possession of a permit are forbidden to enter the Greek Cypriot sector. Those who disobey the order with a view to having trade connections with the Greek Cypriots should pay a £25 fine or should be punished with imprisonment.

"(b) A fine of £1 will be imposed on: (i) Those who converse or enter into any negotiations with Greek Cypriots or accompany any stranger into our sector; (ii) those who come in contact with Greek Cypriots for any official work; (iii) those who appear before the Greek Cypriot courts."

Greek Cypriot courts—what they refer to here as Greek Cypriot courts—are the courts of the Republic; the Chief Justice is a Turkish Cypriot. The most important court in the capital of Cyprus is presided over by a Turkish Cypriot judge. These are the courts of the Republic. Yet the Turkish Cypriots are enjoined not to appear, not to obey the courts; and if they do appear, the legal authorities under which they live will fine them.

"(iv) those who visit the Greek Cypriot hospitals."

The Greek Cypriot hospitals are the hospitals of the Republic. They are not allowed to visit the hospitals for an examination or for pharmaceutical supplies. It is this spirit that is preventing a solution of the problem. I continue:

"(c) A fine of £20 will be imposed on those who have any dealings with Greek Cypriots or on those who buy from Greek Cypriots goods which they can get from the Turkish Cypriot sector, or even on those who get from Greek Cypriots their supplies of goods which we can manufacture—the idea of division. "Similarly should be fined those

who allow the importation of such goods into our sector.

"(d) A fine of £25 or a severe punishment and one month's imprisonment"—illegal imprisonment, of course, but still imprisonment carried out by the Turkish Cypriot leadership—"or whipping should be imposed on those who enter the Greek Cypriot sector for the following purposes:

(i) for a promenade—even if they enter for a walk—

(ii) for friendly association with Greek Cypriots;

(iii) for amusement; and

(iv) for conveyance of information."

These are the conditions imposed on Turkish Cypriots by the Turkish Cypriot leadership, the extremist leadership—and not so much by the Turkish Cypriot extremists, but by the Turkish Cypriot terrorist organization called the TNT, which terrorizes the Turkish Cypriot population, with the assistance of officers from Turkey.

This terrorist organization holds sway in the enclaves. And those Turkish Cypriots who are in the enclaves are in the power of these Turkish terrorist organizations. But their network extends even beyond the enclaves into all parts of Cyprus so as to prevent them maintaining normal relations with the Greek Cypriots. The document from which I read applies to the enclaves but is intended to apply also outside the enclaves to those who conduct any dealings or maintain any friendly relations with the Greeks.

In these circumstances, how can we expect any improvement in the relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots? They are forbidden to have any good relations with their Greek compatriots. This is one aspect."

A reply to these charges was made by the Turkish Representative to the United Nations, Mr. Eralp, which follows:

Mr. ERALP (Turkey). Mr. Rossides has tried to place the cause for the continuation of the unsettled conditions in Cyprus on the lack of will on the part of the Turkish community to improve relations. Well, this can be paraphrased as a lack of will on the part of the Turkish community to submit to the unlawful authority of the Greek-Cypriot administration. I am afraid that it would be too much to expect that the Turkish people of Cyprus should, at this stage—when they have been fighting for nearly 2 years to maintain their constitutional rights—now, gradually, give up what they have been fighting for, and fall under the authority of the illegal Greek-Cypriot administration. They have been characterized by Ambassador Rossides as terrorist organizations. Well I submit that there is only one terrorist organization in Cyprus, and that is the leadership of the Greek-Cypriot community.

The Turks are, as I have said, fighting for their rights. There is civil war going on in Cyprus. Ambassador Rossides read from a document which purported to levy fines on people who consorted with the Greek Cypriots, or on those who traded with them. Well, naturally, Cyprus is not a bed of roses; there is a civil war going on there. Perhaps there is no actual fighting today, but it is liable to erupt at any time. Under civil war conditions—as under conditions of international war—there are such things as penalties for trading with the enemy. In every community which is fighting for its existence, there are those weaklings who sometimes choose the course of cooperating with the enemy. There are measures taken against them; there must be measures taken against them in Cyprus—but I do not know of such measures. We have to rely on Mr. Rossides' information for that. Nevertheless, such things must be understood. The way to achieve a solution to the Cyprus problem is not by ignoring the existence of civil war. It is by facing up to it and trying to find a way of getting out of it.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the Turkish representative tries to justify the fine imposed upon Turkish Cypriots who wish to communicate with Greek Cypriots on Cyprus by saying that such fine must be imposed because "they are trading with the enemy." It would be my hope that Turkey would exert its own influence by denouncing such fines and help create a climate in Cyprus for negotiating a peaceful solution.

There is no question that so long as the Turkish and Greek Cypriots are forbidden to work together toward the solution of their own problem, Cyprus must continue to be a source of concern to the entire free world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the RECORD at this point should include the letter from the President of the Republic of Cyprus to the Secretary General of the United Nations which formed the basis for the U.N. resolution adopted on December 18. It clearly reaffirms guarantees to all minorities in Cyprus.

The letter as published in the U.N. General Assembly record of proceedings of October 11, 1965, follows:

QUESTION OF CYPRUS

I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter from my President, Archbishop Makarios, addressed to Your Excellency, together with a Declaration of Intention by the Government of Cyprus, and accompanying memorandum.

Your Excellency is kindly requested to have the aforesaid letter and attached documents circulated as a General Assembly document.

ZENON ROSSIDES,
Permanent Representative of Cyprus
to the United Nations.

NICOSIA,
October 4, 1965.

YOUR EXCELLENCY, The Government of the Republic of Cyprus, believing that it would be a constructive step tending to relieve any possible anxiety of the minorities in Cyprus regarding their future, has decided to make a declaration of intention regarding the measures the Government proposes to adopt with regard to the rights and safeguards of the minorities in Cyprus, details of which are given in the attached declaration and memorandum.

As Your Excellency will notice from the declaration and memorandum, the Government, following the recommendations of the Mediator of the United Nations, is prepared to accept the presence in Cyprus of a United Nations Commissioner with an adequate staff of observers and advisers who will observe, on such terms as Your Excellency may direct, the adherence to all rights referred to in the declaration and memorandum and for the purpose of insuring observance of human rights to adopt such appropriate machinery as Your Excellency, on the advice, if necessary, of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights, may recommend.

I shall be grateful if Your Excellency will be kind enough to apprise the Mediator of the declaration and the memorandum.

Yours sincerely,

Archbishop MAKARIOS,
President of the Republic of Cyprus.

DECLARATION

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus, believing that a declaration on its part regarding: the fundamental rights and freedoms to be enjoyed by every person irrespective of origin, religion, language or sex; the communal privileges to be granted to the various minority communities in Cyprus; and the municipal remedies and international safeguards for such rights and privileges will be a constructive step toward

relieving any possible anxiety of the minorities in Cyprus regarding their future position;

Having in mind the relevant parts of the report of the United Nations Mediator in Cyprus, declares that it is ready and willing:

1. To apply in Cyprus the following:

(a) A Code of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(b) Autonomy to all minority communities with regard to matters appertaining to education, culture, religion, personal status and other related subjects;

(c) Participation in Parliament of the minority communities, in accordance with the recommendation of the United Nations Mediator;

2. To accept, at the initial stage and for a reasonably transitional period, in addition to municipal remedies for the enforcement of such rights and by way of international guarantee:

(a) in conformity with the recommendation of the United Nations Mediator, the presence in Cyprus of a United Nations Commissioner with an adequate staff of observers and advisers on such terms as the Secretary General may direct; and

(b) more specifically, for the purpose of insuring observance of human rights, the adoption by the Republic of such appropriate machinery as the Secretary General, on the advice, if necessary, of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights, may recommend.

Details of the above rights, privileges and safeguards are given in the attached memorandum.

18. the right to own property alone as well as with others and prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of such property;

19. prohibition of deprivation of liberty for the nonfulfillment of a contractual obligation;

20. the right to participation in cultural life, enjoyment of the arts, and sharing in scientific advancement and its benefits;

21. the right to contract and the right to bargain collectively (including the right to strike);

22. the right to work and exercise a profession and the right to just conditions of work and to safe and healthy working conditions;

23. the right to social security, to social and medical assistance, and to protection of health; and

24. the right of children and young persons and of employed women to protection.

In the exercise of his rights and freedoms every person shall be subject only to such conditions and limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for meeting such requirements of morality, public order, and the general welfare in a democratic society.

II. Rights of individuals considered as members of a minority

In addition to the fundamental rights and freedoms set out above, it is the intention of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus that groups of individuals who possess characteristics differentiating them from the main body of the people of Cyprus—whether they be termed minorities, ethnic groups, or communities—should enjoy autonomy and freedom in matters relating to their respective religion, education, culture, personal status, and related matters.

These rights are the following:

1. To enjoy their own culture;

2. To use their own language: (a) in their personal relations; (b) in their official relations with the authorities; (c) in the courts;

3. To establish their own schools and receive instruction in the language and in accordance with a curriculum of their choice;

4. To profess and practice their own religion and to own and administer religious property;

5. To enjoy full autonomy in matters of personal status, such as marriage and divorce;

6. To have their own educational, cultural, social, and sporting organizations;

7. To issue newspapers and other publications in their own language; and

8. To have representation proportionate to their number on the organs of local government.

NOTE.—The Government of the Republic of Cyprus will grant adequate financial assistance to the schools of the minorities.

III. Safeguards and guarantees

In addition to effective safeguards under municipal law—in particular by entrenchment provisions and recourse to a competent court—the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is prepared to accept, for a reasonably transitional period, United Nations guarantees.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus, following the recommendations of the Mediator of the United Nations, is prepared to accept the presence in Cyprus of a United Nations Commissioner with an adequate staff of observers and advisers who will observe, on such terms as the Secretary General may direct, the adherence to all rights referred to above and for the purposes of assuring observance of human rights to adopt such appropriate machinery as the Secretary General, on the advice, if necessary, of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights, may recommend.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out that these guarantees can be adequately policed by the U.N. peacekeeping force and the U.N. observers on Cyprus.

The negative attitude of Turkey should be discouraged for, Mr. Speaker, a solution to the Cyprus problem lies in the best interests of all our allies, including Turkey.

It is my hope the United States will assert its moral leadership in helping bring about a lasting peace in Cyprus based on the principles of self-determination which constitutes the very keystone of our own Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the United States supports the hopes of creating a more stable climate on Cyprus. Our Nation should now use all of its resources to convince our ally, Turkey, that further obstruction toward a peaceful solution of the Cyprus question only plays into the hands of the Communists who wish to keep the world in conflict so they can reap the harvest of war and privation by sowing their false ideologies.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if our own Government will exert its persuasion on all parties involved in the Cyprus question and urge them all to work toward establishing a better climate of understanding on Cyprus, we can be certain that the Cypriots themselves, with no outside interference, can bring about freedom, dignity, honor, and respect to all the people of Cyprus, regardless of their religion, nationality, or economic status.

I firmly believe the problems on Cyprus must and can be solved only by the people of Cyprus. Our job is to help create an appropriate climate, free of fear or terrorism, among the Cypriots so that they can indeed be the masters of their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker. I have carefully listened to the enlightening statement of Congressman PUCINSKI on the situation in Cyprus.

In January 1956 I brought to the notice of the House the situation then prevailing in Cyprus under British colonial rule and spoke of the need to apply to the Cypriot people the right of self-determination to which they were undoubtedly entitled.

I warned at the time of the potential dangers from the policy of the British Government in bringing in Turkey as an interested party and fostering friction and enmity between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots in an effort to block the application of self-determination to Cyprus. Developments on those lines had further complicated the situation and Cyprus, from a simple issue of self-determination, became a major international problem threatening war between Greece and Turkey, our NATO Alliance, and more generally world peace. The denial of self-determination led to the supposed settlement made in 1959, under the so-called Zurich and London agreements for the independence of Cyprus, which was couched in terms of such divisiveness and imbalance in its provisions as to set the stage for the regrettable strife and fighting in the island that the world has witnessed hardly 3 years after its so encumbered independence.

The Security Council action and the sending of the United Nations force has brought pacification and a relative calm for the last year or so, but there has been lack of progress toward solution of the problem, which the Secretary General ascribes to the nonimprovement in the relations between Greek and Turkish people in the island.

What should be done, therefore, in order to solve this problem is to eliminate the division and strife between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots artificially set up 10 years ago and which started the whole complicated problem. These people have lived together in peace and harmony over the ages and nothing prevents them from doing so again, but the interference from outside for political purposes alien to the interests of the Cypriot people.

An end must be put to the intimidation and terrorism by which the Turks are forcibly prevented from resuming normal relations with their Greek compatriots. For this is the main impediment toward peaceful, democratic, and just solution. Ankara should see reason in this respect and help toward normalization of the situation in Cyprus in the real interests of Turkey and Greece, no less than Cyprus itself and the international peace.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the perplexing situations outside our own shores which concerns the United States of America is that of Cyprus. Already in its second year and well on its way to the third year of tension between our NATO allies, Turkey and Greece, the Cyprus situation is a delicate and increasingly difficult problem.

As a member of the United Nations as well as of NATO, we have been active in our support of the United Nations peacekeeping force on the Mediterranean island. Both the United States and the United Nations are firm upholders of the cardinal principle of freedom and self-determination for all sovereign nations. The history of the United States is based on our willingness to stand behind our belief in freedom and self-determination and we have followed the light of independence around the world without questioning the great sacrifices required.

Today, our American youths are part of the United Nations peacekeeping force in Mediterranean countries. Not only do we seek to prevent war, but we try by all honorable means to aid in reunion and reconciliation of opposing forces. This is our role in support of the United Nations mediation program in Cyprus.

Speaking of Cyprus before the United Nations Security Council on March 19, 1965, my late constituent—Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson—stated:

What is needed now is not a stale repetition of charges and countercharges or a grim adherence to every detail of traditional positions but, on the contrary, a really serious spirit of accommodation which would revive cooperation and ultimately friendship among the nations and communities concerned, and which at the same time could relieve the United Nations and the world from the burdens and dangers which this strife has too long imposed upon them.

That, Mr. Speaker, should be our own position today as we consider the situation in Cyprus; to aid in implementing the United Nations resolution by which the Republic of Cyprus may emerge as a sovereign, unified, independent, and territorially undivided nation. Behind it will be the history of some 3,000 troubled years and before it will stretch the opportunity to take its place alongside of these United States of America as a proud nation, made up of citizens of divergent religions, races, and national origins banded together in a "new birth of freedom."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those of other Members of this House who desire that the blessings of liberty and self-determination be extended to the people of Cyprus.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to thank the gentleman from Illinois, my good friend,

ROMAN PUCINSKI, for obtaining this special order that we might discuss the Cyprus question. The gentleman from Illinois has been a consistent champion of the principles of freedom for all the peoples of the world; I commend him for his interest in this serious question.

Mr. Speaker, a very great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, became a symbol of hope to millions throughout the world when he declared that it was the policy of the United States to support self-determination for all nations in all parts of the world. As a Member of Congress, I have always supported this principle and I strongly support the concept that Cyprus should be granted both internal and external independence, as spelled out in the Charter of the United Nations. This independence means, in short, freedom from foreign aggression.

In conclusion, I long for the day when the people of Cyprus enjoy the fruits of self-determination, and this can realistically be accomplished through the instrumentality of the United Nations mediation effort. I strongly urge the continuation of this effort and I support fully the recent United Nations resolution in support of the territorial integrity of Cyprus.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, "A fool throws a stone into the sea and a hundred wise men cannot pull it out." Thus reads a Greek Cypriot proverb quoted by Lawrence Durrell in his superb book on Cyprus, "Bitter Lemons."

The leaders of the Greek and Turkish communities on the island are certainly not fools. Neither are their counterparts on the mainlands of Greece and Turkey. But they are subjected to the tugs of powerful emotions. They have an obligation, which America shares, not to throw the stone into the sea of open warfare, for then a hundred wise men, or a hundred hundred wise men may have great difficulty in pulling it out.

This, in a nutshell, reflects the primary objective of American policy regarding Cyprus. We seek to use our good offices as a peacemaker to "keep the lid on" and prevent armed strife between Greece and Turkey as well as between the islanders. This effort to prevent two of our closest allies from fighting may cause either or both of them to become angry with us, but such is the frequent experience of peacemakers and we must take it in stride.

I believe that today's discussion in the House of Representatives is best served not by engaging in polemics, but in dispassionately considering the realities of the Cyprus dispute.

The U.N. resolution which gives rise to today's discussion was adopted on December 18, 1965. The essence of the resolution is that the General Assembly:

1. Takes cognizance of the fact that the Republic of Cyprus, as an equal member of

the United Nations, is, in accordance with the charter of the United Nations, entitled to and should enjoy full sovereignty and complete independence without any foreign intervention or interference;

2. Calls upon all states, in conformity with their obligations under the charter, and in particular article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it;

3. Recommends to the Security Council the continuation of the United Nations mediation work in conformity with Resolution 186 (1964).

The resolution was adopted 47 to 5, with 54 abstentions. The United States, voting "No," found itself joined only by Turkey, Iran, Albania, and Pakistan, an unlikely combination, to say the least.

I know that there are some who will jump to the conclusion that this vote indicates that the United States favors Turkey in the dispute. If so, they misread our position. I do not believe we have arrayed ourselves irrevocably or even temporarily in favor of either one side or the other.

Let us analyze the vote. The yes votes were gathered largely from Africa and a scattering of Latin American and Asian nations. Abstaining were the entire Soviet bloc and all of Western Europe. This certainly suggests that there was something more to the issue than a mere reaffirmation of the general principle of self-determination. It must be admitted, however, that the abstentions made possible the passage of the resolution.

America's vote must be viewed in the light of the subtle diplomatic considerations involved. These include our standing with our Turkish ally, which we twice restrained from invading Cyprus in 1964, the belief that the United Nations may weaken its influence in the dispute if it favors one side over the other, and the necessity of looking at the substance, not only the appearance, of the resolution.

What was the purpose of the resolution? Speaking as one sympathetic to the Greek majority on the island, I must observe that, while the resolution seemed to call for merely an endorsement of the right of self-determination, it was actually a well-considered political maneuver.

I do not condemn the Greek Cypriot leadership for this. We can admire their political astuteness in undertaking such a tactic, while reserving our right to put the tactic in perspective.

The adoption of the U.N. resolution was calculated to improve the bargaining position of the Greek Cypriots by bringing pressure of world public opinion to bear in their favor. But it provides no panaceas; it advances no real solutions. The Turkish Government cannot be expected to yield to the opinion expressed. Realistically, the Turkish Government can be expected to ignore it.

What are the realities in Cyprus? One of the realities can be summed up in the words "No more Zurichs." That is, there can be no longer be any prospect of an imposed agreement, as happened in Zurich in 1960. True, agreements between governments require compromise,

but the Zurich Agreement contained such awkward compromises that it was inevitable the formula would break down.

While the Zurich agreement professed to follow the general principle of "majority rule with guaranteed minority rights" the practical effect was that a veto was given to the Turkish minority and effective government was stalemated.

Some may regret that the Turkish Cypriots, one-fifth of the island's population, should have such importance, in view of the fact that they did not significantly participate in the resistance against the British "when the rock devoured the unjust mountain." There is bitterness over the fact that the Turkish Cypriots were boosted to equal rank by the British policies of the 1950's, which sought to play one side off against the other. But the Turkish "awakening" is nevertheless a fact; the views of the Turkish Cypriots cannot be ignored. All parties must deal with the situation as it is, rather than as it might have been, which can also be said about our involvement in other parts of the world.

Quiet reigns on the island today, an uneasy quiet. There have been few incidents during the past year. This can be attributed partly to the presence of the 7,000-man U.N. force and partly also to the apparent belief by both sides that time favors them.

The Turkish minority seems to feel that by staying in its enclaves it emphasizes that the Turks cannot live peacefully among the Greeks and thus its demands for partition as the only solution is reinforced. The Greek majority, with 80 percent of the population and even higher percentages of the wealth and the educated elite, controls the island's government and economy. They feel that they can afford to sit tight, and that eventually the Turks will decide to leave their enclaves.

In my judgment, there is no early solution in sight. What is clear is that no "agreement" is viable without the participation and approval of Archbishop Makarios. Indeed, now that Cyprus has become an internal political issue in Turkey, the views of the Turkish Cypriots must be taken very seriously in Ankara. Thus, there can be no bilateral Athens-Ankara agreement nor an agreement imposed by the great powers. This means that eventually there must be serious talks between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots.

Enosis is on the back burner, but eventually it must be considered a likely development. It may take 5, 10, 20, or 50 years but it almost certainly will come to pass. After all, it was the drive for enosis—together with a thirst for freedom—that generated the revolt against the British. And enosis remains in the hearts of the Greek Cypriots today.

Nationalism is by far the strongest "ism" on the island. But it is a nationalism which yearns for attachment to the respective mainlands. Recent visitors to the island capital of Nicosia tell me that you see Greek flags and Turkish flags flying but the only Cyprus flag to be seen flies over the Cyprus museum. This indicates that the motherlands

count for more with the people than any feeling of Cypriot nationhood. Indeed, it suggests that the Zurich Agreement making Cyprus an independent nation was only an unavoidable intermediate step.

The United States must exercise tact and patience in exploring gently and cautiously the prospects for agreement.

In this regard, Dean Acheson's 1964 efforts to mediate are to be commended. The temper of the participants and the course of events may some day reactivate his unofficial proposals as a basis for renewed negotiations.

In general, Mr. Acheson suggested enosis, with the renunciation of Turkish rights of intervention, in exchange for the leasing of a Turkish or NATO base on the island and the transfer of a small island in the Dodecanese to Turkey.

And what of the Soviet Union? The Russians have constantly shifted position, playing for their own personal advantage. They support no alternative to instability. They shrink from enosis, for it would bring NATO to Cyprus. They do not favor partition, for it would bring NATO to Cyprus twice. They are unlikely, therefore, to play a constructive role.

Although no early solution is visible, things seem to be moving gradually in favor of Archbishop Makarios and the Greek population, which is overwhelmingly devoted to him. The main danger to peace, they feel, does not come from forces within the island, but from a Turkish government which may grow impatient and mount an invasion. A delicate waiting game is being played, edged in danger. Well-intentioned mediators must tread softly.

Secretary General U Thant, in his latest report on Cyprus, said in December 1965:

The U.N. force is needed in Cyprus. It may be no exaggeration to say that it has become almost indispensable for the time being. On the other hand, it would seem clear that it cannot be kept there indefinitely; possibly not even for very much longer. Financial stringencies alone would probably dictate this, although there are other considerations which would make such a prolongation undesirable * * * one of the latter being that overreliance on the United Nations to prevent recourse to armed force and even to help maintain the status quo could be a factor in reducing the sense of urgency of the contending parties about seeking solutions for the underlying differences that caused the eruption of violence in the first place.

U Thant also said that—

The key to the settlement lies in the last analysis, with the parties primarily concerned.

He expressed the conclusion that:

Mediation in some form offers the main hope for a breakthrough to future harmony and tranquility in that troubled isle.

In this context, the U.N. resolution is not decisive. It is a phase. The main steps to eventual and permanent peace remain to be taken.

We are all for self-determination. But how do we apply it? This is the challenge to the patience and wisdom of all interested parties.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, and that all other Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE JOHNSON-McNAMARA MISCALCULATION OF THE WAY TO BEAT VIETCONG GUERRILLAS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we now have almost 300,000 fighting men in South Vietnam. The number is increasing rapidly. Soon it may reach half a million. Fast becoming apparent is the probability of the United States getting bogged down in an Asian land war—the trap that delights the Communists of Peiping and Moscow alike—and is the very thing Gen. Douglas MacArthur warned against, saying, "No sane men would get into a war like this."

Although most Americans fly their flags high in support of the men fighting and dying in Vietnam, by the millions they are beginning to suspect something is tragically wrong with the way President Johnson and Secretary McNamara are running the war. It is an unconventional war. Its time and place were the choices of the enemy. Its war of liberation strategy and guerrilla tactics were chosen by the enemy. The Johnson-McNamara response to this unconventional challenge has been the troop buildup. In light of the MacArthur warning this may well be seen through Hanoi's eyes as to its advantage, not to ours.

The reason is simple. Secretary McNamara himself has declared that a 10 to 1 manpower superiority ratio is needed to overwhelm Vietcong guerrilla forces. It is estimated that at the beginning of this year some 225,000 Vietcong were in action. The Defense Secretary believes Hanoi is capable of sustaining up to 300,000 Vietcong in the field. Application of his 10 to 1 ratio reveals a need for 2¼ to 3 million men on our side fighting against them. Not over one-half million of these ever are likely to be South Vietnamese troops. Few of our so-called allies are likely to come up with any substantial manpower. The net result of calculations of this kind is that six to eight times the number of Americans fighting overseas at the height of the Korean war will be needed in Vietnam.

Moreover, even if we achieved such a superiority ratio—which is highly unlikely on a regional basis, let alone throughout South Vietnam—there is a chapter in the guerrilla handbook which instructs the Vietcong exactly what to do. They are simply told to slip back up to the Ho Chi Minh Trail long enough to get us in a mood "to bring the boys home," then slip back down again the moment

the ratio reduces to their favor and pursue their drive for conquest to success.

If we are to achieve in Vietnam whatever will legitimately pass for a victory, we cannot do it by playing patsy for the enemy's unconventional warfare strategy and tactics. In the end it is sure to defeat us, no matter what euphoric terminological inexactitudes the administration uses to filter, flavor, disguise, and deodorize the outcome.

An unconventional war must be fought unconventionally if it is to be fought successfully. Last Monday I mentioned to the House a number of psychological warfare actions that might be productive in North Vietnam. Many of these might be put to effective use against the Vietcong in the south. By strumming on the myths, superstitions, and ignorance of the Vietcong their morale and will to fight can be damaged severely. Already we have in South Vietnam an intelligent and dedicated group of U.S. Information Agency and military experts trained and wise in the ways of psychological war. They are not getting the encouragement and not given the freedom to operate they should be. They should be unleashed and enthusiastically financed and supported. In the past they have experienced difficulty even in getting necessary aircraft to drop pamphlets and communicate recorded messages by loudspeakers.

At the same time, President Johnson and Secretary McNamara—who are tightly running this war—must get released from their self-hypnotic vision that the way to overcome guerrillas is to immobilize them beneath the sheer weight of vast numbers of Americans in uniform. The "10 to 1 technique" was used successfully by the British in Malaya only because the number of guerrillas was relatively small. Even there the successful outcome was due less to getting a heavy manpower superiority than it was to the fact that the British managed to develop dossiers on almost every last guerrilla. Many dossiers even included the subject's photograph to further assist in the identification process.

In short, the President and his Secretary have tragically miscalculated what it takes to defeat guerrillas. It is not principally numbers of antiguerrillas, but numbers in combination with identification of who the guerrillas are. Identification is the key factor because it denies guerrillas the use of guerrilla tactics and they just are not guerrillas anymore.

The situation in Vietnam explains why. The Vietcong do not wear uniforms. They never have. They never will. They wear the same "black pajama" costume all Vietnamese wear. They hide in the forests and rice paddies and in the mangrove swamps. Often our soldiers on land and sailors patrolling the inland waterways have no way to join battle with them except to discover their whereabouts by getting shot at, then firing back in the general direction from which the bullets are coming. The unrecognized Vietnamese walking past you in a village by day may be the Vietcong guerrilla attacking you by night. Such attacks can, and do, occur almost anywhere in South Vietnam. Vietnamese

workers on a U.S. base may be the plastic explosives sabotage experts who infiltrate that base under cover of darkness to destroy our aircraft and blow up Americans—or even bicycle boldly up to a barracks in Saigon and bomb it.

They successfully get away with their guerrilla tactics because it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify them. More often than not they slip away from the scene of their carnage for the same reason. As long ago as 1776 by cutting to pieces George III's redcoated regulars Massachusetts guerrillas proved that "hit and hide" tactics are essential for a 10th-class power to bring a 1st-class power to its knees. If you let them get away with it by letting them keep on hiding, the same result can be expected in 1966, a full 190 years later.

It makes no sense whatever to neglect the use of any effective and civilized means there may be to identify the Vietcong. It only makes dead and wounded Americans. Yet a great hullabaloo went up when our commanders in Vietnam took the simple, humane initiative to use common teargas to flush guerrillas from hiding places. The use of this non-lethal and only temporarily disabling chemical was equated with the release by the Germans of deadly cruel and terrible gases during World War I. The resulting shock wave reverberated the Johnson-McNamara political antennae and almost prohibitive restrictions were slapped on the use of measures against the Vietcong which any police chief can use against Americans in any city of the United States. Fortunately they have been eased somewhat.

Tear gas has its specialized use and is not valuable as a generalized means of wide scale Vietcong identification. There are several ingenious, practical, and relatively cheap and simple suggestions for going about this. I will discuss one of them today. It is the use of a harmless, long-lasting bright yellow dye to stain their clothing and their persons. Dyeing the Vietcong could, in the end, prove more effective than killing them.

Throughout South Vietnam there is almost continuous bombing by aircraft of suspected Vietcong concentrations located by intelligence means. It can be seen frequently from the rooftops of Saigon. Last year 1 ton of bombs costing about \$2,500 per ton was dropped for every Vietcong in action. Not too many Vietcong are killed, even by colossal B-52 raids, simply because it is blind, area bombing. The Vietcong cannot be seen beneath a cover of tropical growth. A clever effort to locate and bomb them around their hidden cooking fires at mealtime using infrared heat detectors was quickly foiled. The Vietcong simply began lighting a large number of fires and cooking over only a few of them.

If instead of dropping TNT bombs over an area, an equal tonnage of dye were dropped, it would not be possible for the Vietcong to move without getting stained. The dye might also be used to crisscross the Ho Chi Minh trail to mark many Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars before they even get to the south. None of these people have any spare clothing to replace that stained. Their

skin discoloration would last as long as a suntan. Thus their guerrilla usefulness would be seriously impaired for many weeks while the discoloration persisted.

Inescapably a number of Vietnamese who are not guerrillas would be stained. This is not a serious objection from the military security standpoint since already there exists a monumental problem in separating even unstained Vietnamese between VC and non-VC. Presence of the discoloration would reduce the magnitude of the problem by turning up many, many more guilty suspects to put through the separation process.

It is interesting to note that "dye bombing" is considerably cheaper and more simple than explosives bombing. The latter requires aerodynamically efficient bomb casings, rugged fuses, and other paraphernalia. Dye could be dropped in as simple a container as a wax paper milk carton. TNT bombs cost roughly \$1.25 per pound. Dye bombs would cost only a few cents per pound. The cost of explosive bombs for a single 30-aircraft B-52 raid in Vietnam approaches \$2 million. Dye bombs would cost only a fraction of that sum. Even the addition of fluorescent chemicals such as used in household detergents to produce "whiter than white" laundry would not greatly increase cost. They are harmless and possibly could be made persistent.

In closing it is well to anticipate the bleeding hearts who will throw up their hands and raise their voices in wretched screams over the alleged inhumanity of dyeing people yellow, even if they are killing America's sons. They should become aware of the fact that U.S. chemical companies today are actually selling "people dye" to some countries which use it on election days for the humane and honest purpose of preventing repetitive voting.

They might also recall some million American soldiers and sailors who fought World War II in the Pacific wearing sickly yellow complexions from taking Atabrine to avoid malaria. In this connection the psychological significance of this physically harmless weapon must not be overlooked. It is illustrated by the story of the GI in New Guinea who, being upbraided by his sergeant for sagging morale, quipped, "Yea, but it does something to you to go around looking like a banana month after month."

It is sincerely hoped the President's discussions at Honolulu with military commanders and Republic of Vietnam counterparts may lead to a healthy re-evaluation of the conduct of the war and open up, at least to consideration, fresh ideas regarding it.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT ONE OF THE RESOLUTIONS OFFERED CALLING FOR THE CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during the limited debate in the House on Feb-

ruary 2 regarding the seven privileged resolutions from the Committee on Un-American Activities, calling for the citation for contempt of the House of seven witnesses who had been subpoenaed to appear before the committee, I presented a motion to recommit one of the resolutions offered.

That motion to recommit would have referred the resolution to a select committee composed of seven Members of this body, appointed by the Speaker, and instructed to examine the sufficiency of the resolutions for contempt citations under existing rules of law and relevant judicial decisions. After completing such an examination, the committee would have reported the resolutions back to this body with a statement as to its findings.

Along with my colleagues, who offered similar motions and supported my motion for recommitment, I felt there had not been enough time allowed for thorough study and thoughtful deliberation of the resolutions and the consequences which would ensue from their passage. The motion to recommit was defeated by a vote of the Members of this body. However, my conviction that the proposed procedure of that motion is a sound and much more justiciable one than that under which we presently operate has not been lessened by the action taken here in this instance. The experience we have just had, under the rules now dictating the action of this body in the consideration of citations for contempt, is an apt illustration of the weaknesses and summary unfairness of our present procedure.

The issues before this body in its consideration of the resolutions were complex, posing intricate and involved questions of fact and law. The rights and privileges of the individuals cited for contempt, as well as those of the House, as a body, were inextricably intertwined with the question whether there had, in fact, been a contempt of the House.

It was a serious threat to the propriety of the results and an assault on the propriety of the procedure that the statements of fact, the hearing records, and the actual text of the citations were not available to the Members for a period of time sufficient to study the issues, to weigh the facts, and then to arrive at a reasonable balance of the interests involved.

We are charged, in situations such as this, with the responsibility of initiating a serious Federal proceeding. That responsibility can hardly be competently discharged when the facts of the case are virtually unknown to us. The important documents containing the record of the proceedings out of which the citations for contempt originated, when printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, covered some 63 pages of triple-column, fine print. Yet, they were not available to the Members until the start of the meeting of the House during which the votes were to be taken.

I believe it is evident from the wording of my motion that my dissatisfaction was not with the work of the committee nor a protective move for any organization which has, or will be, investigated by it.

My concern was a procedural one, as was indicated by my vote for the resolutions, while offering and voting for the motion for recommitment of the resolution.

I also believe the integrity and effectiveness of the sanction of citation for contempt of the Congress must be preserved. The action taken by the House, in the manner it was taken on February 2, does a disservice to this important right of the House to the extent that it dissipates the effectiveness of our action and lessens the credibility of the charges made. Such has been the case in the past with unfortunate results. The record shows some 93 percent of the citations coming out of the House have not resulted in convictions.

The efficacy of the present procedure is challenged by the fact that such a large number of the contempt citations initiated by this body have turned sour. The absolute necessity for reform of that procedure is evident from the low percentage of convictions which have been obtained by the Federal proceedings ensuing from our actions.

Therefore, I am joining today the company of a number of my distinguished colleagues who have introduced legislation for procedural improvements in contempt citations by the Congress, by filing legislation providing that resolutions for these citations be handled, as a permanent part of the procedure of the Congress, in the manner proposed by the language of my recommitment motion.

One does not have to be a legal scholar to realize the inequities and injustices of our present procedure. Nor need one be a statistician to see the virtual ineffectiveness of that procedure.

We must take action now to uphold this sanction of the Congress for the preservation of its rights and the dignities of its member bodies. The lip-service we have paid the existing procedure in the past has served to remove the sting from this sanction. The continued erosion will soon find us without means of enforcement where the will of this body or its committees has been unjustifiably defied.

I am proud to add my name to the roster of the Members of this body who have introduced this legislation. I urge its early consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, while the lesson we have once again been taught by these recent proceedings is fresh in the minds of us all.

Thank you.

ATTEMPTS TO CREATE AN ANTI-MISSISSIPPI ATMOSPHERE BY EMOTIONAL ASSERTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1966, a mimeographed letter from my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] was circulated to the Members of this body, in which he attempted to create an anti-Mississippi atmosphere by emotional assertions of, "the eviction of the homeless and hungry people from the abandoned Air Force barracks in Greenville, Miss., last week."

I feel that I cannot and must not let these charges go unanswered.

First, I question the motive of the gentleman from New York, and whether he has genuine concern for those on whose behalf he speaks.

I believe that the National Labor Relations Board records will show that on two occasions in a span of 10 years, the Channel Master Corp. had charges relating to their suppression of the rights of his workers successfully prosecuted against him. Can he sincerely be interested in the rights of citizens of Mississippi when he acted in such disregard of the rights of the workers in his own company?

Recently when the gentleman from New York visited my State back during congressional adjournment, he made charges, after only 3 days of visits, that he had found widespread discrimination against Negroes in the Agricultural Stabilization and Soil Conservation Committee elections. Since he was a strong supporter of the illegal Freedom Democratic Party's attempts to unseat the Mississippi congressional delegation, and since his trip to Mississippi was promoted by this same group, I seriously doubt that my colleague could be objective in reaching his conclusions.

As far as the statement in his letter of February 7, regarding a recent takeover of a Greenville Air Force Base by a group calling themselves the Poor Peoples Conference, I cannot understand how the gentleman from New York can condone such unlawful actions. The various left-wing groups, whether they be called SNCC, COFO, the Council on Human Relations, the NAACP, the Freedom Democratic Party, or the Poor Peoples Conference, I understand use "freedom of assembly" as their excuse for demonstrations. However, the law does not permit such a group of demonstrators to literally take over Government property. The fact that this property happened to be inactive at the time is immaterial. The next time it could be the naval air station at Meridian or the Air Force Base at Biloxi. I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent account of this case of illegal trespassing on Government property. The article appeared in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. It follows:

AIR POLICE ON WAY TO INVADE GREENVILLE BASE
(By Kenneth Tolliver)
GREENVILLE—Civil rights squatters, 1; Air Force, 0.

That's how the score stood at the end of the first day of the invasion of the Greenville Air Force Base by about 50 Negro and white civil rights workers.

But the score may be different Tuesday. Lt. Col. George Andrew, officer in charge of the old base, said Monday night that air police were being flown to Jackson and would come up by bus to take charge of the situation.

He also said that Gov. Paul B. Johnson had offered the use of the Mississippi Highway Patrol and of the National Guard.

"I think we will see some action tomorrow," he said.

The total on the base was boosted by six Monday night when six more climbed the fence and joined the others inside the building.

The invasion started at 7:15 Monday morning and continued until after lunch.

ROAR THROUGH

Early Monday morning a caravan of cars and a small bus pulled up at the C gate of the 2,000-acre deactivated air base and told the guard they were headed for the Southern Airways ticket office. When the guard protested, they roared through the gate.

The group then broke into a locked Air Force building, moved in complete with sleeping gear and a few suitcases and issued a printed list of demands.

Among the demands made for food, heat, jobs, and training, the group asked to be given the land the base stands on and the more than 200 buildings on the land.

The land belongs to the city of Greenville and the Air Force was in the process of returning the control of it to the city when the invasion occurred.

Ironically, the city of Greenville intends to open a vocational training school and a college at the former base; and classes would be open to white and Negro alike.

The Negroes' statement identified themselves as the Poor People's Conference and claimed connections with the Freedom Democratic Party, Mississippi Labor Union, and the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches.

WANT FRESH MEAT

The statement also charged that Federal commodities were "old and full of bugs and weevils" they said they wanted fresh vegetables, fruits, and meat. "We want to decide what foods we want to eat," the statement read.

Further demands included that poverty programs be taken out of the hands of county supervisors because "they don't represent us. We want the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire poor people we say represent us. We, the poor people, want to distribute the food."

President Johnson was called on to answer the question "whose side are you on, the poor people or the millionaires?"

KICKED COLONEL

The squatters were asked to leave by Colonel Andrew, and for an answer, one of the white civil rights workers kicked him in the shin.

"It might have been accidental," the colonel said later.

About noon more Negroes, including babies and elderly persons arrived and moved into the frame building.

Because the base had been deactivated, no electricity, water, or heat was available and the squatters brought a pair of coal stoves to keep warm.

They broke the glass from two windows under the watch of FBI agents and poked their stovepipes out into the air. They then proceeded to fix lunch.

The demonstrators were openly hostile to reporters and shouted words of contempt to anyone who questioned their actions.

They sang and chanted familiar "freedom songs" and asked all who came near for food, clothing, and jobs.

One Negro asked a Clarion-Ledger reporter to "take me home, I am your brother."

Earlier in the day, the Washington County sheriff's department and the Greenville police had gone to the base to confer with Colonel Andrew but later Washington County Attorney John Webb declared the matter was an Air Force concern and ordered the lo-

cal law enforcement officers to leave the base.

This action had a visible effect on the Air Force and the 27 civilian employees at the sprawling base.

COLONEL SHRUGS

Colonel Andrew spoke several times with Air Force generals on the telephone, called Washington and consulted with the Justice Department and the Pentagon and ended up with a shrug of his shoulders when asked the results.

"I would like to know myself," he smiled at reporters.

Earlier he said he was concerned with the safety and welfare of the squatters and said that he feared the building might catch fire and burn.

Inside the frame, one-story structure, the demonstrators crowded around their stoves and sang.

Since there are no sanitary facilities operating in the building, they have been stepping outside and relieving themselves in the snow.

Inside, they huddled together in their blankets, both white civil rights workers and Negroes, both male and female.

"Hey, take our picture," a Negro male called to a reporter as he cuddled with a blonde white woman. "This will make news."

FBI agents maintained a watch on the proceedings and took photographs, but made no effort to interfere.

JUST OBSERVING

One agent said that although Government property had been damaged and that a Government building had been broken into, "until the Justice Department issues warrants and makes complaints, we can do nothing but observe."

Sleet and snow were forecast for the area and from all indications the group had no intention of moving on. On the door of the building they had placed a crude sign saying, "This Is Our House—Please Knock."

Attorney James Turner from the Civil Rights Commission in Washington would not comment to reporters after he arrived on the scene, but did say "It is up to the Air Force."

The Air Force may be fierce in Vietnam, but in Mississippi, it seems to have met its match.

The gentleman from New York undoubtedly will make assertions of racial discrimination in my State. I would ask him: How concerned was he when riots in his own State of New York took the lives of 5 people and injured nearly 500 at a cost of nearly \$5 million to his State? The following article that appeared in U.S. News & World Report, September 14, 1964, gave a very accurate account of racial violence in and around the State of New York. I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

LOOTING: THE HIGH COST OF RACE VIOLENCE

(Go into big-city neighborhoods wrecked by Negro rioters and you get a picture of what mob violence is costing this country. What happens to property owners who suffer crippling losses? And what happens to the hoodlums? Here is the story from five cities.)

Week after week, rioting by Negroes spreads from one big northern city of the United States to another.

Philadelphia, in the closing days of August, was added to the growing number of riot-rocked cities. There, groups of Negroes ran wild for 3 days. They broke into stores, stripped them of merchandise and carried off their loot in full view of police.

Elsewhere, in recent weeks, riots erupted in New York City, Rochester, N.Y., Jersey City, Paterson, and Elizabeth, N.J., and Dixon, Ill., a suburb of Chicago. Baltimore officials revealed on September 1, that they

had warnings of riots ahead in their city. Washington, D.C., has had hints of trouble to come. So have Cleveland, St. Louis, Detroit, and several other cities.

The cost of all this rioting—totaled up city by city in the chart at the end of the article—already has grown into the millions of dollars. Approximately 1,000 people have been injured, 5 killed.

All this violence is raising such angry questions as these:

Are property owners and law-abiding citizens being denied the protection for which they pay taxes? Are some politicians, perhaps afraid of Negro voters, withholding from police the authority to use the power that is needed to control rioting mobs and stop their looting? What recourse do property owners have for the heavy financial losses that they suffer from rioting?

A statement of a Philadelphia police sergeant, printed on page 39, expresses a view that is frequently heard among policemen called upon to face Negro mobs: "Our hands are tied."

William H. Parker, chief of police in Los Angeles, sees the attitude of some big-city politicians toward lawbreakers as leading this country toward anarchy. Chief Parker's views, from an interview, are set out on page 40.

For on-the-spot assessments of the riots, how they started, the way they were handled and the property damage and personal injuries they caused—"U.S. News & World Report" sent members of its national staff into five cities where riots have occurred in the last few weeks. Their reports follow.

PHILADELPHIA

Rioting exploded here late on the night of August 28 and spread over 4 square miles of a predominantly Negro section of the city.

What caused it? Rioting began soon after a routine police attempt to remove a Negro woman from a car that was blocking traffic at an intersection. The woman resisted, bystanders intervened, then mobs of Negroes began pouring into the streets.

The pattern was strikingly similar to that of previous riots in other cities.

Philadelphia's Mayor James H. J. Tate says there is proof that the rioting was "planned, organized and triggered" by some group that was only awaiting an incident to provide an opportunity.

Civil rights not involved?

In Philadelphia, as in the other northern cities, there was no apparent connection between the rioting and civil rights. Philadelphia for years has admitted Negroes equally to schools, restaurants, theaters and all public facilities. There is considerable integration in housing. The city's Human Relations Commission watches out against racial discrimination.

"This was not a civil rights demonstration," said District Attorney James C. Crumlish. "These were hoodlums rioting. They will be treated as hoodlums."

The Philadelphia rioting turned into large-scale looting. Nearly every store on one main thoroughfare, Columbia Avenue, was broken into, windows smashed, goods stolen. Negroes could be seen carrying stolen merchandise openly down the street. One was observed carrying a sofa on his back.

A home-furnishings store lost more than 100 major appliances. The owner, Ben Goldberg, says, "They got at least a dozen automatic washing machines that weigh 150 pounds apiece. I figure I lost at least \$20,000."

A dry-goods merchant, Sam Neranblatt, says he lost his entire stock, worth \$15,000, in one night of looting. He is bitter about what he charges was a lack of police protection and what he thinks was a hands-off policy imposed upon the police.

A pawnshop owner, wiped out, says: "Civil rights? Where are my civil rights?"

An indignant businessman says: "It was practically giving them a license to steal."

The only rioter shot was one who had a long police record and who attacked a policeman with a knife.

Mayor Tate told critics that extreme methods by police could have caused a terrible blood bath in Philadelphia.

Casualties were high. Of at least 341 persons injured, about 100 were police.

Property damage, still being calculated, will run well into the millions of dollars.

Who bears the cost?

Mayor Tate has assured victims that the city will reimburse them under an old State law that holds cities liable for riot damage. He estimated that this cost to the city might run to as much as \$3 million.

Also, the mayor said, the rioting may cost the city an extra \$7 to \$10 million a year for added police protection. He warned: "Probably we may have to make a small increase in taxes."

The Federal Government's Small Business Administration is speeding loans to victims. Private banks have pledged the fullest cooperation.

Yet many businessmen are sure to wind up with heavy losses that no kind of insurance or Government aid can make up for completely.

A businessmen's association said that 10 percent of its members whose stores were damaged do not plan to reopen.

What happens to the rioters and the looters? A special riot court was set up to try the 774 arrested. Almost 90 percent of them were found to have police records. Some have been sentenced to jail terms, others fined.

ROCHESTER

Three days of wild rioting by bands of Negroes in late July are estimated to have cost this community between \$2 and \$3 million dollars.

City officials have warned the people of Rochester that an increase in tax rates is almost inevitable if the city is required to pay victims a share of the damages they suffered.

The biggest item on the bill of damages is for the vandalism and looting in 204 stores. Police estimate this damage at about \$700,000—of which some \$431,000 is for stolen goods.

Merchants think this \$700,000 estimate is low. They point out that it does not take into account the business they lost as a result of the rioting.

In spite of the heavy financial losses taken by the merchants in the riot area, "not many are giving up," says Daniel Rothman, a furniture dealer who is president of the Joseph Avenue Businessmen's Association. He estimates that about half the damaged stores have been reopened for business and the others are about ready to reopen. Many stores are operating with their fronts still boarded up.

"I lost 67 feet of glass along my front," Mr. Rothman says. "It cost me \$2,000 to replace it. I also lost about \$11,000 worth of furniture and other items."

TV at bargain prices

At the height of the looting, Negroes were selling \$495 color television sets for \$6. Looters had so much liquor they were throwing full bottles at police.

"We had just got in a new line of fall clothes," says Sol Rosenberg. "The looters cleaned us out. The next day, with the temperature 98, we could see our heavy fall clothes walking along the street."

Costs of the rioting include: about \$150,000 for National Guard troops and \$137,000 in overtime for State troopers sent in to help police; \$85,000 to hire additional city police; \$200,000 for extraordinary city expenses, including damage to vehicles; an

estimated "tens of thousands" to prosecute rioters.

Merchants so far have filed claims totaling more than \$70,000 against the city. Many more claims are expected.

Whether the city will have to pay is still to be tested in courts.

The claims are filed under an 1855 State law which holds cities or counties responsible for riot damages.

However, that 1855 law was suspended as an emergency measure during the recent war years. The suspension law has not been taken off the books and no postwar test of the legal situation has yet been made.

Meanwhile, the city is referring damage claims to its insurance company.

It remains doubtful how much, if anything, merchants will ever recover.

Many merchants were privately insured—but they are worrying whether they will be able to get reinsurance, in view of the growing frequency and mounting costs of race rioting.

City of harmony

Rochester was counted as one of the least likely places in the country for a race riot. This city, which has about 33,000 Negroes in a population of 300,000, has little unemployment, a high degree of racial integration, and was proud of its record of racial harmony.

Yet trouble exploded after a routine arrest by two white policemen of a Negro charged with being drunk.

Although 976 persons were arrested in the rioting, none of them has yet been convicted and sentenced to jail.

Nearly 700 got off with suspended sentences, mostly on charges of disorderly conduct. So far, only 53 have been indicted by the Monroe County grand jury, most of them on charges of rioting which carry penalties up to 5 years in jail.

The grand jury freed 33 for lack of evidence, which is often found difficult to gather in the confusion of a riot.

Prosecutors here say their job would be a lot easier if there were a State law specifically covering looting.

What if another riot occurs here?

"If it happens again—goodby," say many merchants. But Mr. Rothman disagrees. He predicts:

"I don't think the police will be so lenient the next time."

NEW YORK CITY

The Nation's largest city was the first to be hit by the wave of riots.

Violence here began in Harlem, the big Negro district, on July 18, and spread into Brooklyn before being brought under control 5 days later.

Businessmen are still suffering from its consequences.

More than 500 business places were damaged. Losses from property damage and theft alone are commonly estimated at nearly \$2 million.

"But the physical damage is not the most important thing," says the owner of a clothing store in Brooklyn.

"The damage to goodwill and to the community feeling—there is no way to put a dollar figure on that. It took a little of the heart out of a businessman. There is a feeling that it might happen again."

Business has fallen off in stores throughout the riot-torn areas. The owner of several large furniture stores reported his business down 50 percent.

"I've been here 20 years," he said. "But if this keeps up I'm getting out."

A restaurant owner, reporting a decline of 20 to 25 percent in his trade, said: "People are still dubious about coming into this area."

Values of business enterprises have declined. You find many store owners who say they would like to sell out but would

have to take much less than they could have gotten before the riots. The owner of a large supermarket said:

"The goodwill value of a location here has depreciated. It may return. But very few businessmen now would entertain the idea of coming into a colored area."

One of the most serious long-term effects of the riots, this businessman suggested, may be a change in the type of people who live in the riot areas—a change for the worse.

"Some of the nicer people are moving out," he said. "People are disturbed, especially older people. You can feel the constant tension."

The owner of a specialty shop in Harlem pointed out:

"The majority of the people here were not involved in the rioting. There are just a comparatively few rotten apples who cause the trouble."

But the effect has been to make people wary about going anywhere in the area—especially in the evening. Many places that used to stay open in the evening now close earlier.

In New York City, as in Rochester, merchants who suffered riot damage look hopefully to an old State law that makes the city liable for payment of damage claims.

Claims for personal injury or property damage totaling about \$1.5 million have been filed against the city of New York. But whether riot victims can actually collect on their claims depends upon whether courts rule that the old law is still in effect after a wartime suspension.

Very few of the places looted and damaged are said to have private insurance protection to cover their losses.

What happens in court

More than 500 arrests were made during the riots. Charges ranged from malicious mischief and disorderly conduct to burglary and grand larceny. The cases are being handled under routine legal procedures.

A supermarket manager said:

"A policeman told me a year ago that, when police arrest a Negro, 9 times out of 10 some white judge will let him off. We need better judges who are not so politically minded. This sort of thing makes people have no respect for law and order. Perhaps it may have contributed to the rioting."

New York's riots began as a protest against the killing of a Negro youth by a white police lieutenant. Negro agitators cried "police brutality."

On September 1, a grand jury cleared the policeman of criminal liability in the youth's death.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.

This city still wears scars from its early-August riots that left 46 people injured and 71 stores smashed.

A number of those stores are still boarded up. Many have not reopened and some probably never will. Total costs of the riots are estimated to be about \$300,000.

Claims of merchants trying to collect some of their losses from the city are just starting to reach the courts—with still no ruling on the effectiveness of an ancient State law which could make New Jersey cities liable for riot damage.

Several people are still in hospitals recovering from gunshot wounds, gasoline-bomb burns or severe beatings.

No one seems to understand what really caused the riots—which began after a routine police arrest of a Negro woman for drunken brawling.

Few people here expect the rioting to be resumed, however. The reason is that word has gotten around that Jersey City's mayor won't stand for any more rioting.

Police have orders to clamp down fast and hard—and shoot if necessary. Special riot

squads are ready. No holds are to be barred—next time. Rioters and looters are told in advance what their penalty will be. Chief Magistrate Robert Wall, who handed out stiff sentences to the August rioters, now says this:

"Anyone involved in a riot or breaking the law by looting under these circumstances will get a year in jail—the maximum sentence I can give."

Moral breakdown

Mayor Thomas J. Whelan has conferred with officials, clergymen and Negro leaders at length in recent weeks about the riots' causes and ways to prevent any recurrence. He told a member of the National Staff of "U.S. News & World Report":

"These riots are not essentially a race problem. They are a symptom of what's behind the growing crime rate in this country. I believe it's a breakdown in moral fiber of many of our people."

"There's a new lack of respect for law and order. You see it everywhere these days. It seems to stem from a lack of stability in family life. It's especially tough in our Negro community where there often isn't any family life to speak of."

"The immediate answer to these riots, once they start, is force. I believe that you have to be firm and use whatever force is needed to put down illegal rioting and looting."

"In the long run, though, the answer has to be found in better living conditions for our Negroes and in better training for their youngsters. We are trying to carry out economic and educational programs with that in mind here in Jersey City."

Elizabeth and Paterson, N.J., also were ripped by Negro riots in August. The toll in those cities added up to 14 persons hurt, 37 shops vandalized.

CHICAGO

It was a comparatively small-scale riot that erupted August 16 in Dixmoor and Harvey, Ill.

But it alarmed all Chicago—because Dixmoor and Harvey are suburbs of this city, and the racial hostility displayed in the suburban riot is found on a far larger scale inside Chicago itself.

Some clues to the reasons for the suburban riot may emerge from a Cook County grand-jury study, starting September 9, of the evidence against 80 persons—43 Negroes and 37 whites—who were arrested in the riot.

What set off the violence was a Negro woman's charge that a white man roughed her up after accusing her of stealing gin from his liquor store.

A crowd, mostly Negro, gathered. Bongo drums were heard.

"Then I knew we had trouble," says Harvey Police Chief Matt Roder.

Mob action

A rock was thrown through the liquor-store window and the riot was on. At its height, police estimated 1,000 persons were milling in the area. Passing cars were stoned, some whites were dragged from their cars and beaten. The following night a mob set fire to the liquor store.

But property damage was relatively minor—and there was no looting.

Stanley Gruszczyk, chief of the Dixmoor force of 10 part-time policemen, says he is still surprised because:

"We've had Negroes living here right along, and people here take integration for granted. I didn't think a place could be any more integrated."

About half of Dixmoor's 3,600 residents are Negroes. Harvey has a large percentage of Negroes among its 29,000 population.

Chicago, however, contains 800,000 Negroes, many in crowded slums. And Chicago has a history of racial tension marked by fre-

quent conflict. Chicagoans grow alarmed as they see the wave of mob violence spreading.

Trouble in many cities

Besides the major riots, there have been incidents of racial conflict in one city after another in many parts of the country.

There were attacks by mobs of Negroes on police in Kansas City, Kans., and Cleveland, Ohio, early in August.

In Detroit, Mich., on August 29, a white youth was stabbed and six other persons injured when fighting between Negro and

white youths broke out in an area set aside for teenagers at the Michigan State Fair.

Some 200 white and Negro youths battled in Keansburg, N.J., on August 28. On the same day a shooting spree erupted when police tried to arrest two Negroes in Memphis, Tenn. About 200 whites and Negroes fought in Westminster, S.C., on August 30.

Week by week, the human toll and financial cost of mob violence rises.

Now warnings are heard of more riots to come, and concern grows.

What Negro riots have cost—A city-by-city report

City and date of riots	Killed	Injured	Arrested	Shops looted or damaged	Dollar cost to community ¹
Philadelphia, Pa. (Aug. 28-30).....	0	341	774	225	More than \$3,000,000.
New York City (July 18-23).....	1	144	519	541	\$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000.
Rochester, N. Y. (July 24-25).....	4	350	976	204	\$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000.
Jersey City, N. J. (Aug. 2-4).....	0	46	52	71	\$300,000.
Paterson, N. J. (Aug. 11-14).....	0	8	65	20	\$50,000.
Elizabeth, N. J. (Aug. 11-14).....	0	6	18	17	Minor.
Chicago suburbs (Aug. 16-17).....	0	57	80	2	Do.
Total.....	5	952	2,484	1,080	\$6,500,000 to \$8,500,000.

¹ Costs include damage to buildings, stolen merchandise, cost of troops and extra police and, in some instance estimates of business losses.

[The following article was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Aug. 30, 1964]

"OUR HANDS ARE TIED," CRIES POLICE SERGEANT

(A beleaguered city police sergeant called the Inquirer Saturday night. His embittered statement, which follows, reflects the feeling of many policemen trying to fight a "war" under extraordinary circumstances.)

"During the rioting, we were told not to use pistols no matter what. Our only weapon was to be our night sticks.

"How the hell do we defend ourselves?

"We try to defend citizens and their property and even our own men, yet we have nothing to help ourselves. This is not fair to the public, let alone ourselves.

"We were told not to interfere with the rioting or the looting.

"We saw people looting the stores, and we didn't stop them.

"I have been on the force 15 years. If I knew of a better way to make a living, I'd leave the force—and I'm not the only cop that feels this way. If they want us to do a job, why do they tie our hands?

"The city gave these people the green light to go ahead. Would the mayor take the same position if this was taking place on Chestnut Street or Market Street? What would he do then?

"These little shopowners—we felt sorry for them. But we couldn't do anything to help them. Why should these poor people be out on the streets? These people are ruined.

"I never saw anything like it in my 15 years. It's a voting gimmick. Decency should be for the small man as well as for the big man.

"We should be allowed to protect the property in any manner that we see fit.

"Tear gas is the best solution, and the police should have masks.

"We don't want any violence, but if the city does not wake up this is only the beginning.

"This has nothing to do with civil liberties. This is outright looting. And we can't do anything about it because our hands are tied."

THE ROAD TO ANARCHY

(Excerpt from an interview with one of the Nation's leading police officials, Police Chief William H. Parker, of Los Angeles, that appeared in the Aug. 10, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report)

Question. Can a society survive if a people can choose to obey some laws and not

the others, and to flout the police whenever they wish?

Answer. Of course they can't. I made this statement to people in high positions in the Federal Government when it appeared they were condoning the violation of local laws held by some people to be unfair. I said then that as long as the Federal Government appears to support the violation of local laws, which have neither been repealed nor declared unconstitutional, the Federal Government is advocating anarchy.

Question. Yet aren't clergymen and politicians saying that it's all right to violate some laws?

Answer. Oh, I'm sure of that. Without quoting names, I have read public statements by such persons saying that, if the law was not based in justice, then it need not be obeyed. This is what they call "civil disobedience." But when you do that, you then violate the very basis upon which this democratic republic must rest—and that's the rule of law.

The minute you countenance a disregard of the rule of law, you begin to destroy that which keeps a free society together. And then you're going to get sporadic anarchy until sometime the man on the white horse will come forward and lead you into slavery under the pretext of solving your problem. This is history.

Mr. Speaker, and what did my colleague from New York say about an incident in Brooklyn, N.Y., when in February of last year a total of 300 were arrested after an attack by Negroes on policemen. An article which appeared in the New York Times on February 19, 1965, gives a full account of this incident. The article follows:

THREE HUNDRED STUDENTS RIOT SECOND DAY, ATTACK POLICE IN BROOKLYN
(By Martin Tolchin)

Three hundred rampaging Negro students from boycotted schools swept through downtown Brooklyn yesterday, hurling bricks at policemen and breaking store windows in a second day of rioting.

Noonday shoppers jumped into doorways of Fulton Street stores to avoid injury during the hour-long melee in which nightsticks were used freely by 100 policemen, including a mounted troop.

The police arrested 17 youths whom they slammed against the hoods of unmarked

police cars and frisked. The youths were then taken to the Poplar Street station.

Five adults were arrested by attendance officers on charges of abetting truancy, and eight young children were returned to their schools.

BOY HAS PLASTIC GUN

The disturbance, which followed rioting by 400 students on Wednesday, began at 11:45 a.m., with the arrest of a 14-year-old who had waved a plastic water pistol while on a picket line at the city health department office at 295 Flatbush Avenue Extension. The picket line was made up of more than 200 school boycotters who swarmed around the arresting policeman.

"Break it up," ordered Assistant Chief Inspector Patrick J. Whalen. "Move with the crowd."

The police chased the youths, who abandoned their placards bearing drawings of rats and slogans such as "All rats must go" and "We want decent jobs."

COURT REJECTS APPEAL

The picket line was organized by the City-wide Committee for Integrated Schools, which yesterday lost an appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

The committee had sought to transfer to Federal court jurisdiction a State injunction obtained by the board of education to halt the boycott, which was organized January 19 by the Reverend Milton A. Galamison to protest alleged segregation in the city schools.

James B. Donovan, president of the board of education, said yesterday that "it is not possible to take more effective measures than have been taken" to halt the boycott until the Federal question is finally resolved. The appeals court granted a postponement of the hearing on the State injunction until February 23, in the event that the U.S. Supreme Court should agree to hear the case.

"The judicial process seems slow, but it is unrelenting," Mr. Donovan commented.

He added that mass arrests of hundreds of boycotting students were "impractical," implying that the students would only cause trouble if they were sent back to school.

ATTENDANCE NEAR NORMAL

The rioters were among 5,500 students who were absent yesterday from 27 schools—boys high school, 21 junior highs, and 5 "600" schools for disturbed children. Board of education officials said attendance at all schools was more than 80 percent, or almost normal.

Mr. Galamison accused authorities of deliberately trying to deny students their right to demonstrate. He denounced the use of mounted police.

Deputy Police Commissioner Walter Arm replied: "If the Reverend Galamison objects to our use of horses, our answer to him is that he is using children."

A police horse hit by a brick was the day's only casualty. The horse, Grainer, an 11-year-old gelding, reared up when he was struck on the rump. Trooper John McHugh, who was riding Grainer, quickly calmed him as boycotting students jeered: "Hi, Ho, Silver."

Many youths apparently arrived with bricks in the pockets of their black leather coats and woolen duffel coats. A brick narrowly missed the forehead of a mounted policeman, and other bricks were thrown at several foot patrolmen.

The brick throwing began when the police dispersed the picket line and chased the youths down Flatbush Avenue Extension and into Fulton Street. The youths chanted civil rights mottos, "Freedom Now" and "Jim Crow Must Go."

GIRL CALLS FOR LOOTING

But other cries were also heard. "Turn out, get me some clothes," said a teenaged

girl, running toward Albee Square. A teen-aged boy who dallied at the entrance of McCreery's department store, shouted: "We're going in here and loot."

There was no looting, however, and the youths, chased by the policemen, ran to the board of education's headquarters at 110 Livingston Street. There they were placed behind wooden barricades.

Attendance officers approached eight of the smallest students, asked them which school they normally attended, and then took them back to school. They also arrested five adults, including Sheldon Zinn, of 1371 Linden Boulevard, who shouted as he was led away: "Don't start any trouble. That's what they want."

Also arrested were the Reverend James R. McGraw, of the Warren Street Methodist Church; Paul F. Heinegg, of 177 Midwood Street; Barbara D. Loeb, of 350 Lefferts Avenue; and Leroy O. Fredericks, of 131 Moore Street.

The youths then began to circle the block, walking and running, eight and nine abreast. As they crossed Schermerhorn Street, they were observed by students at St. John's University, who crowded around third-story windows. The Negro youths jeered: "Come on down," in the sing-song manner of a television commercial.

The university students—some from St. John's, had clashed with the rioters Wednesday—watched silently. Policemen stood guard outside the doors.

The boycotting students then turned down Boerum Street, apparently intending to return to the front door of the board of education. Mounted policemen cut them off, however, and directed them back to Fulton Street, where the window breaking began.

Eight boys smashed a plate glass window of the Prisco Travel Bureau, 1 Albee Square, and punched and kicked a policeman who attempted to arrest them. A mounted policeman closed in, and the youths threw a brick that narrowly missed his forehead.

Police reinforcements overwhelmed the youths seconds later. The boys were slammed against an unmarked police car, and told to raise their hands above their heads. A youth who resisted was placed in handcuffs by 3 policemen as 100 youths standing behind the policemen on Albee Square jeered.

POLICEMEN USE CLUBS

The youths then raced toward the Flatbush Avenue Extension, where they broke another plateglass window, at Junior's Restaurant, on the corner of Fulton Street. Mounted policemen closed in on a group of boys who lingered at the window, and Mrs. Marjorie Leeds, an adult boycott leader, shouted: "Get those horses away from these kids."

The police used their billy clubs as they chased the youths down Flatbush Avenue Extension and into the Albee Square field parking lot, where the students tried to open car doors, all of which were locked.

Police squad cars raced into the lot, their sirens wailing. Mounted policemen trooped behind as the youths then headed back to Albee Square.

CLERGYMEN MARCH

On the square, white shoppers shouted at adult boycott leaders before television cameras.

"They're a disgrace to the human race," a white woman said.

"You're a disgrace," a Negro woman replied.

Meanwhile, fire engines raced down Fulton Street in response to a false alarm turned in at Fulton Street and Rockwell Place.

Thirty ministers walked on an early morning picket line in front of the board of education. They distributed a leaflet bearing the names of Suffragan Bishop Charles Boynton of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, and 50 other clergymen. Bishop Boynton

had marched on a picket line in front of the board on Tuesday.

The leaflet read: "We will not be intimidated by primitive actions against fellow clergymen and others who join this struggle. We will not be deceived by evasive 'crash programs' for ghetto schools. We, the clergy of New York, carry a heavy burden of guilt for the present crisis. By our silence we have sanctioned the evil of segregation."

At his press conference, Mr. Donovan said that clergymen who supported the boycott were acting out of "ignorance."

"We have adopted the Allen report in principle," he said. "We are awaiting specific recommendations on how the Allen report can be implemented without lowering the educational standards of this city."

Mr. Donovan promised to invoke "every available criminal penalty" against the boycott leaders. But he conceded that "we could have moved to punish them for contempt [of the supreme court temporary restraining order], but have not done so, least it be said that we're basing this action on an ex parte order" obtained without a hearing.

Again, my colleague was silent on May 22, 1965, when a mob in the Bronx section of New York attacked a policeman and released a Negro prisoner. A UPI account of this incident appeared in the Washington Post on May 23, 1965. I also insert this article in the RECORD.

MOB ATTACKS POLICEMAN, FREES ARRESTED NEGRO

NEW YORK, May 22.—A chanting, shouting mob of 200 Negroes surrounded and attacked a white policeman in the Bronx last night and released a Negro prisoner the policeman had apprehended. A white grocer who tried to help the policeman was stabbed in the back and critically wounded.

Four persons were arrested as a result of the assault and later attacks on other policemen and detectives stemming from the incident.

The mob surrounded Patrolman Philip Siegel, 43, and hit him with a pop bottle before his prisoner fled from the scene.

Later, two detectives and a patrolman, seeking witnesses were attacked by two men and a woman, who were arrested.

The trouble started when Siegel spotted two Negroes breaking the window of a shop and caught one of them after a chase.

He took the youth back to the furniture store and telephoned the police station for a patrol car.

Soon the mob milled around Siegel and began chanting, "Let him go."

When the policeman tried to put handcuffs on the suspect, he was struck from behind and shoved to the ground. The suspect started to run, Siegel drew his gun, fired a warning shot in the air and again caught the suspect.

Once again the mob closed in on Siegel and chanted, "Why did you shoot?" and "Let him go."

One of the mob, armed with a soda pop bottle, stepped forward and told Siegel "we're going to take him away from you."

He hit Siegel on the hand with the bottle and the prisoner broke free and fled.

Siegel, his gun pointed at the mob, was backing away when he heard a voice behind him saying, "All right, officer, I'm with you."

"I didn't turn because I wanted to keep facing the crowd," Siegel said.

He explained that the voice was that of the grocer, Enrique Negron.

As police reinforcements arrived on the scene, the mob scattered and Negron was found sprawled on the sidewalk with a stab wound.

Edward Collins, 18, whom the policeman identified as one of his attackers, was among the arrested, charged with felonious assault.

MILWAUKEE

At least 50 persons looked on without helping as youths armed with a switchblade knife, a nail-studded board, and a chunk of concrete beat three motorcyclists Friday night, police reported yesterday.

Samuel Hicks, 43, suffered a broken jaw and was knocked unconscious during the attack. Donald Peterson, 29, was cut and bruised and his wife, Margaret, 23, was also bruised.

The victims are white. They said the four teenage boys who attacked them were Negro.

NEW ORLEANS

A fist fight between a group of young whites and Negroes at a bus stop in New Orleans early yesterday resulted in the fatal stabbing of one of the white men.

Frederick Riehm, 21, New Orleans, died in a hospital a short time after being stabbed in the chest.

Three white teenagers said they were in a car with Riehm and drove past a bus stop where six young Negroes were standing when, they said, one of the Negroes threw a rock through the car's rear window. They got out of the car and the fight followed.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from New York, Where was he when these and other so-called acts of racial discrimination took place? Did he personally investigate these incidences as he did those in Mississippi? Did he bring these problems to this body? Has he taken steps to have these New York problems corrected? I feel sure that the answers to these questions will be all negative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I think I have the proof on that.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the Jackson, Miss., Daily News of December 2, 1965, Mr. RESNICK's celebrated 2-day visit to Mississippi, he was interviewed at a press conference and an article appears in the Jackson Daily News by Mr. William Peart, Daily News staff writer. In the course of the news conference with Mr. RESNICK, it was pointed out by these reporters that deplorable crime and poverty conditions existed in New York City and in the State of New York. They inquired of Mr. RESNICK as to why he was down in Mississippi investigating conditions that existed in Mississippi when the same, or worse, conditions exist right under his nose. I quote from Mr. RESNICK's answer as reported in the Jackson Daily News:

"I would like it known," he said, his eyelids fluttering, "I represent the 28th Congressional District of the State of New York—not New York City."

He inferred, not delicately, that New York State was not his responsibility."

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. I thank my colleague.

I feel sure that the answer to these questions from Mr. RESNICK is that Mr. RESNICK has not looked around his own backyard.

This brings me to the strong conclusion that the gentleman from New York had motives other than those of mere concern for the so-called poor Negro when he ventured more than a thousand miles from home to discover racial problems.

With that, I would like to tell you one other thing about New York City. We ship produce into New York City as we have for a number of years. I go into that area quite often. Quite often some Negro man from the South or some Negro woman out of the South will approach me. They know I am from the South because of my southern accent. They ask me for money to buy food. So many times they have told me that if they ever get the money, they are going back to the South. I have asked them why. I have heard it said so many times that Negro people want to leave the South and go to the North because they are treated so good up North. On every occasion they have laughed at me. They tell me then when they are broke in New York, they are nothing more than like some animal on the street, but when they are broke in Mississippi they are fed and put to work and they would be given something—and they always are.

REPLY TO CHARGES OF WRONG-DOING IN MISSISSIPPI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I hope I shall not use an hour.

It is with a great deal of fear and trepidation that I rise to take issue with the distinguished authority on the State of Mississippi whose great broad knowledge of our State was gained in a 2-day visit, which I understand was consumed mostly with press conferences.

The speech he made today was not unexpected. As a matter of fact, it was predicted in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News on the date of Mr. RESNICK'S arrival in Jackson. I quote from the Jackson Daily News:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Nov. 30, 1965]

COVERING THE CROSSROADS WITH JIMMY WARD

Probably representing the biggest hunk of brains that ever came into Mississippi in one fat wad, Congressman JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, Democrat, of New York, invades Mississippi today to conduct a 3-day inspection tour and Representative RESNICK is expected to ascertain all kinds of brutality and discrimination on his tour of mean ol' Mississippi.

When Congress convenes next January and as a result of his inspection tour of Mississippi, Representative RESNICK is expected to make a series of speeches deploring this State and appealing to the inflamed minority groups in New York and elsewhere. If Representative RESNICK doesn't do such a thing it will come as a major surprise because that's the way the political railroad is being run these days.

Meanwhile, the FBI announced today the crime figures for the first 9 months of this year. Representative RESNICK'S own city of New York rates huge increases in every single category of crime for the 9-month

period compared to that of last year and last year was a most deplorable situation in Gotham.

Already this year New York shows 462 murders compared to 443 last year; 891 rapes compared to 779 last year; 6,691 robberies compared to 5,679 last year; 12,553 assaults compared to 11,307 last year; 51,730 cases of larceny compared to 50,732 last year and 25,075 auto thefts compared to 23,890 last year.

While Representative RESNICK is gathering gross evidence of all sorts of wrongs from draft-dodging elements here in Mississippi, a new development is noted off the wires in New York. The department of hospitals in that city is asking the new mayor for an additional \$500,000 to combat an increase of crime in hospitals where people are supposed to go for rest and recuperation. It seems that in New York 91 additional security guards are needed at 21 hospitals to complete a force of 581 patrolmen just to guard patients at hospitals.

Thefts from hospitals amount to \$100,000 per year and at least three rapes occur every year by sadists who invade the rooms of patients.

It is hoped Representative RESNICK has a fruitful inspection trip and that he can find plenty to complain about to his constituents in New York. It is hoped that at the next session of Congress Representative RESNICK will create fancy new legislation to correct the evils of this awful State of Mississippi.

May I say that my good friend Jimmie Ward, the editor of the Jackson Daily News, who wrote that article, certainly had a very clear and workable crystal ball, did he not?

The gentleman from New York—my very rich, industrialist colleague from the State of New York, who represents the silk stocking Hyde Park District, which, according to his own testimony, contains about 3 percent members of the minority race which he champions so vehemently—I am sure has invited these poor, displaced Negroes, for whom his heart bleeds so profusely, to come up to the State of New York and give them jobs in his factory. He is reportedly a rich man, and should be able to afford it. And if he does not have jobs for all of them, certainly he has wealthy friends in industries up there—they are highly industrialized—who would be very happy to take these people in and give them good jobs.

But I am afraid that when he finds that the bona fide nonagitating Mississippi Negro is offered such a job, he will turn it down, because he prefers to remain in the State of Mississippi where he can always get the help of his friends, the white people who have befriended him through the years.

A few minutes ago, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] made a statement here on the floor of the House. Incidentally, I am sorry he is not present now, and I would like for the RECORD to show that fact. He was put on notice he was going to be exposed to the truth, and I presume he just could not take it, because he took off like a rabbit as soon as he got through, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] who also maligned the State of Mississippi, and who represents one of the most crime-ridden areas in the United States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] said that our answer was going to be that this was a Communist-led

movement. Well, that is not going to be all of our answer. It is going to be part of our answer. The fact is that it is a Communist-led movement. He admitted that there may be a little smattering of Communists, but they are not the leaders.

Just offhand I can recall the names of some of those leaders who have been in Mississippi and who have also taken part in the Communist movement—the first one that comes to mind is the distinguished demagog from Yale University, the professor who is trying to get the United States to surrender to the Vietcong, the Reverend, I believe—most of them are "Reverend"; they put that in front of their names—Staughton Lynd. Did you know that he went to Vietnam a few weeks ago over the objections of the U.S. Government purportedly to try to negotiate with the Reds? Do you know where he spent the summer of 1964? Down in the State of Mississippi, agitating and trying to organize movements to incite trouble in the State of Mississippi.

I can think of another one, a fellow by the name of Mario Salvo, who spent the summer before last in Mississippi doing the very same thing, and then spending last summer, if I recall correctly, cranking up the riots at the University of California at Berkeley.

I can think of two more. One is Herbert Aptheker, a self-confessed Communist who accompanied Staughton Lynd to Vietnam the other day, and his daughter, Bettina Aptheker, who is also a notorious Communist, both of whom have been actively sticking their noses into the business of the people of Mississippi.

Then there was a fellow named Thomas Hayden who went with Lynd and Aptheker on their Vietnam surrender mission. He is a well-known troublemaker who has also peddled his poisonous wares in Mississippi.

I can think of a couple more, of Carl and Ann Braden, both of them Communists. They are veteran troublemakers and skilled agitators who have been sticking their noses in our business down in the State of Mississippi. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] wants more names, let him come over to my office, and I will give them to him.

That is the crowd down in Mississippi that is leading these movements.

Why, did you know, all of the people who were shocked the other day by the unprecedented seizure of Federal facilities at Greenville Air Force Base—incidentally, that it is where I got my basic training. I went through the second class at Greenville Air Force Base as a pilot cadet—those people who were surprised and stunned by this, were people who did not know the facts and did not know the background of this movement.

Of course, you know what happened, from reading it in the paper: 150 Air Force policemen—not Mississippi sheriffs, not Mississippi constables, but Air Force policemen, young soldiers—were flown in from the air bases in four States. They were needed to forcibly eject—the peaceful mob? Oh no—the kicking, cursing, screaming, and spitting mob.

Lieutenant Colonel Andrews, who was directing the operations, was kicked on the shins by one of these mobsters. At least a dozen of these fine young men in our Air Force were injured hauling these trespassers and squatters out of this air base.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am happy to see the gentleman has returned. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman is aware, at the same time that this was happening, that a number of Negroes froze to death in their shacks in the delta?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the gentleman name one?

Mr. RESNICK. I would be very happy to. It was reported in your paper, the Delta Democratic Times.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How many people froze to death in New York last week in their homes and cars?

Mr. RESNICK. Any number of them froze to death in their cars recently. To the best of my knowledge, I repeat again, during the last storm that we had in New York, which was a severe one, the city of New York requisitioned armories, opened up the armories to people whose houses were not heated properly. When that was not sufficient, the city rented hotel rooms to house the people whose apartments were cold.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the gentleman is not too well acquainted with history, but I would remind him that in 1927, during the Mississippi flood, when it was necessary to move hundreds of thousands of Negroes to safety, the State of Mississippi moved in with every resource at its command and took care of the people, both white and colored, without discrimination.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that the city of Greenville is one of the most forward cities, one of the finest cities that I know. It happens to be in my district. It has been for 4 years.

If these people had been as the gentleman from New York has described them, the city of Greenville would have made accommodations available to them in a minute. The press says that the Department of Justice was unable to get the names and addresses. So far as we have been able to find out, the Attorney General was unable to, so that he could supply housing. Unfortunately, for the purpose they had in mind, the Greenville facilities did not have television cameras, and of course would not have served their purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Exactly.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I would like to finish the colloquy.

I would like to point out to the gentleman that in 1927, the State of Mississippi needed every Negro that it could get to pick cotton. It does not need those hands anymore. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there is no longer

a need for these many, many thousands of Negroes to work the cotton fields of Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is exactly right. Last year, in debate on the farm bill, we attempted to point out that the passage of that bill would mean the loss of jobs for farmworkers. Faced with a cotton acreage cut of 25 to 35 percent, obviously the landowner has to cut back on expenses. Merchants as well as farm labor have been severely hurt.

My wealthy colleague from a silk stocking section of New York, who is now complaining, should have thought of the economic hardships for these poor Negroes for whom his heart bleeds, now, the hardships that would result from the passage of the bill when he voted for that bill. But I fear the gentleman is interested in only one thing; that is, the votes he can get by going down there and concocting stories out of his very fertile imagination, about the State of Mississippi. Those do not solve economic or social problems.

We need to let the free enterprise system work without overregulation by Government, but the gentleman has voted for every single bill that has been before this House that would extend the long arm of Federal control over the actions of individuals and individual businesses.

Mr. RESNICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As far as yielding further, I am busy cultivating a crop of knowledge for the House of Representatives and I just do not have the time to take out time now to be shucking nubbins and I decline to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have something to tell the gentleman, and then when I get through and if I do not have anything else to do, I will yield to him.

Mr. RESNICK. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The radical agitators that moved into the Greenville Airbase, in effect, declared war on the Federal Government and they threatened to secede from the Union unless the Government met their completely unreasonable demands. Their position was disclosed by a Rev. Arthur Thomas, a guiding light behind the insurrection movement, who was quoted as saying:

The Government has not done anything for us, so why should we recognize it? We want to make our own rules.

Because such flagrant defiance of our Government is unique in our history, I feel that the tactics of this motley band of agitators who instigated this conspiracy to undermine the law should be exposed to public view. The facts will show that this militant group was not attempting to better the conditions of poor people but, in fact, was interested solely in sowing the seeds of dissension and revolution. Plans for the seizure of Federal facilities were not mapped in Greenville. It was not a spontaneous thing. They were mapped in a 3-day meeting sponsored by the Delta Ministry,

the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and the Mississippi Freedom Labor Union, a subsidiary of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Where? In Greenville? Oh, no. At Edwards, Miss., 150 miles away, at a place known as Mount Beulah. This was done—and I will give you the dates—on January 28, January 29, and January 30. The meeting was characterized by a series of rebellious harangues, including one by the aforementioned Reverend Thomas of the Delta Ministry. He incited the crowd by urging them to take by force that which they wanted.

You know, when these people appeared at the Greenville Air Base they did not walk. No, they came in by private automobile; they came in late model automobiles, and they came in rented automobiles. And do you know that they sometimes rent twin-engine airplanes to go places? And you say they are hungry? Do not make me laugh. They are some of the best financed agitators in the United States.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will take care of you when I get through with what I have got to say, if the gentleman can just wait.

Mr. RESNICK. It is courteous of my colleague.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman had his hour.

Mr. RESNICK. I yielded to you, and I believe I yielded to your colleagues in every instance at the point where you wanted me to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. He did not yield to me.

Mr. RESNICK. I yielded to the gentleman now holding the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a unanimous-consent request. That is what the gentleman did for me. Besides, I might say that this is a show horse parade, and if we want any jackasses in it, we will bray for them.

Now, what do these people want? Starving people? You know what they did when they first got to the airbase?

They passed out mimeographed copies of press releases when they first got there. Oh, no; they do not have enough to eat, to feed themselves, or to keep themselves warm and clothed, but they have money with which to own mimeograph machines and drive late-model automobiles.

Now I am going to quote from the demands that they made—not on the city of Greenville—these are the demands that they made on the commander of the airbase at Greenville. This is entitled "What Are We Demanding?" I quote:

1. We demand food. We are here because we are hungry. Our children cannot be taught in school because they are Negroes.

And do you know that the State of Mississippi spends a larger percentage of its budget on the education of children, both white and colored, than any other State in the Union? Do you know that we are spending more money on the

education of our Negro children than we are on our white children? And they say, speaking of that:

Our children cannot even get food in school because they have to buy it and do not have the money.

Ridiculous. We answered that one a few minutes ago. Their second demand is:

We demand jobs.

Many of us have been thrown off the plantations on which we have been working all of our lives. We do not want charity—

They say—

We demand our right to jobs so we can do something with our lives and build us a future.

Now, is not that a beautiful thing to dream of? Of course it is. They do not say anything about getting jobs for which they are qualified. They do not say they are willing to work in order to receive their pay. They simply say they want the jobs, and that they want the jobs handed to them.

Third—

Mr. Speaker—

we demand job training. We demand that the people be trained for the things that they want to do, and that they be paid while they are being trained.

Well, you have any number of Government programs that would take care of that situation for them, including the GI bill of rights, the poverty program, and numerous others.

Fourth, we demand income. We demand that poor people be given an income, but until we get an income for our families, we want commodities which are fit to eat. The commodities we get now are old and full of bugs and weevils—

You know, I have a colored friend down home who gets commodities. He does not care anything about that powdered milk they give him. He does not like it. So, you know who he gives it to? He gives it to me. We like it.

He gets some dried beans every now and then—the same kind that goes into the bean soup in the House Restaurant. He says he does not eat those beans. You know who he gives them to? He brings them to my house. He says:

Would you like to have these, because if you don't want them I am going to throw them away anyhow.

Well, he gets so much cheese in those commodities, until it builds up on him, and every now and then he brings that to me, a 3- or 4-pound block of cheese, and it is pretty good stuff.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I am not yielding. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, I will tell you something else about this man. When he needs money, you know who he comes to? He comes to me, and he gets it.

They say:

The commodities we get now are old and full of bugs and weevils. We want fresh vegetables, fruit, and meat. We want to decide what foods we eat.

In other words, they want to decide what foods are going to be given to them free of charge. So would I—so would I. My wife and I have a little argument every now and then when she gives me meat loaf when I would like steak. But I take the meat loaf.

Now, Mr. Speaker, No. 5. Now, here is the clincher:

We want land. There are thousands of acres here that the Government owns, and we are supposed to be a part of the Government. We want the cleared land and the uncleared land. We will clear the uncleared land ourselves.

Who is "we"? Is "we" 195 million people who own the United States? How are you going to divide the Greenville Air Force Base up 195 million ways to get everyone an even break; so as not to discriminate?

No. 6, we want Operation Help to be stopped. We do not want the Mississippi County Board of Supervisors to have another chance to decide whether poor people should get food. We do not recognize these county boards, because they do not recognize us. We want the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire poor people, if they represent us. We, the poor people, want to distribute the food.

Well, I cannot take much exception to that, because as I understand it the Office of Economic Opportunity has about five times as many people being paid \$19,000 and \$20,000 on a pro rata basis as the other established agencies of our Government. I would like to see a little of that money get down to the poor occasionally, as I am sure you would. I am not going to take exception to that. I would like to see the poor people handle it.

But under the present setup I doubt that they will ever get any voice in it.

We demand that the operation of Head Start schools be started now.

We demand that OEO give us the money they saved—which they promised to us last September so that our children can be taught in Head Start schools.

That is all right. That is partly what the money is for.

But I am not in favor of giving it to this group; not after the example of incompetence and corruption which they showed in the Mount Beulah operation last year.

We are ready now to ask President Johnson, "Whose side are you on—the poor people or the millionaires?"

That is what these people are asking President Johnson.

Signed:

The Poor Peoples Conference.

So that these demands may be read in continuity and as one document, I include them herewith:

GREENVILLE, MISS.,
January 31, 1966.

WHY WE ARE HERE AT GREENVILLE AFB

We are here because we are hungry and cold and we have no jobs or land. We don't want charity. We are willing to work for ourselves if given a chance. We need help to get started now.

We are at Greenville AFB because it's Federal property, and there are hundreds (dozens) of empty houses and buildings. We need those houses and the land.

WHAT WE ARE DEMANDING

1. We demand food. We are here because we are hungry, our children can't be taught in school because they are Negroes. They can't even get food in school because they have to buy it and don't have the money.

2. We demand jobs. Many of us have been thrown off the plantations where we worked for nothing all of our lives. We don't want charity. We demand our right to jobs, so that we can do something with our lives and build us a future.

3. We demand job training. We demand the people be trained for things they want to do and that they be paid while they are being trained.

4. We demand income. We demand that poor people be given an income, but until we get an income for our families we want commodities which are fit to eat. The commodities we get now are old and full of bugs and weevils. We want fresh vegetables, fruit and meat. We want to decide what foods we want to eat.

The Federal Government tells us to go directly to the State and county for help, but when we go there they don't know what we are talking about.

5. We demand land. There are thousands of acres here that the Government owns. We are supposed to be a part of that Government. We want the cleared land and the uncleared land and we will clear the uncleared land ourselves.

6. We want Operation Help to be stopped. We don't want the Mississippi County Board of Supervisors to have another chance to decide whether poor people should get food. We don't recognize these county boards because they don't recognize us. We want the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire poor people if they represent us. We, the poor people, want to distribute the food.

7. We demand that Operation Head Start schools be started now. We demand that OEO give us the money which they promised us last September so that our children can be taught in the Head Start schools.

We are ready now to ask President Johnson "Whose side are you on—the poor people, or the millionaires?"

(Signed) THE POOR PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE.

Now, after these agitators had moved into the buildings, they brought in potbellied stoves and kerosene lanterns. They were "starving to death" but they could go out and buy potbellied stoves and kerosene lanterns.

They threatened to set fire to the facilities if the demands were not met.

There were no sanitary facilities available in the building.

Now let us see, Mr. Speaker, just who are these hungry and tattered unfortunates?

The Washington Post reported on February 6 that many of the revolutionists after being removed from the building returned to their homes more than 100 miles away.

That is not me talking—that is the Washington Post talking. That is the bible of the liberals. That is the uptown edition of the worker.

The true character of the agitators is portrayed by a statement to a newspaper photographer by a young Negro male cuddled in a corner with a white female:

Take a picture, this will make news.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the same bunch that claims to be impoverished, always seem to be able to finance everything else they need including mimeograph machines and automobiles.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. When I get through, I will yield to the gentleman if I have any time left and if I feel like it.

The striking similarity of the demands of the so-called Poor Peoples Conference and the Communist Activists group—yes, I am getting to them. You said I would and I am getting ready to get to them—by revolution in other countries is indeed shocking.

Unqualified demands for land reform runs the same as those made by Castro's band of Communist misfits prior to the revolution that Castro instigated.

Do you know what Raoul Castro said? He said:

The concentration of land in the hands of a few is not Cuba alone. It lodges in many cubicles in more than one country of the continent.

It is not strange, therefore, that the revolutions should be unfolding under similar circumstances in many other arduous struggles of the people in other countries.

Land reform is the fundamental law of revolution.

So says Raoul Castro.

An inspection of some of the groups and individuals that plotted the rebellious actions in Mississippi reveals the relationship of the movement to the international conspiracy.

I am glad that the gentleman came back in the Chamber because I am going to repeat a few of these names. He said there were no leaders in the group. There were Staughton Lynd, Mario Salo, Anne, and Carl Braden, the Apthekers, and there are numerous others whose names do not come to my mind at the moment, but if the gentleman wants more I have them—I have a file plumb full of them.

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman would yield, I would prefer that, to answer the gentleman, that is what the gentleman would prefer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman wants to make a unanimous-consent request for additional time, I will yield for that purpose.

REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. RESNICK. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a special order after all other special orders of the day and other legislative business of the day have been concluded to address the House for a period of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair would advise the gentleman that pursuant to the practice of the House, Members are limited to a 1-hour special order per day. The Chair would be glad to entertain a request for a special order for a later day.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. An inspection of some of the groups and individuals that plotted the rebellious actions in Mississippi reveals the relationship of the movement to the international Communist conspiracy.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities files show the Reverend Warren H. McKenna, head of the Delta Ministry project, was at various times from 1957 to 1964 affiliated with the following organizations identified by the U.S. Attorney General as Communist front groups:

Samuel Adams Schools, American Continental Congress for Peace, World Peace Conference, Civil Rights Congress, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Jefferson School of Social Science and the World Youth Festival.

McKenna has supported the following organizations cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities: American Continental Congress for World Peace, Mexico; World Peace Congress, Minute Women for Peace. He has opposed punitive action against Communist and Communist-controlled organizations in the following instances: Conviction of trustees of the bail fund for Communist leaders; conviction of 11 Communist leaders, ouster of Communist controlled unions from the CIO—he even wanted the Communists to stay in the CIO—amnesty appeal for convicted Communist leaders; support of the Committee of One Thousand defending individuals with Communist records in the motion-picture industry. He urged clemency for the Rosenbergs, atomic spies. In his article in the New York Herald Tribune of August 18, 1957, page 25, Herbert Philbrick, a former member of the Communist Party in Massachusetts, referred to McKenna as "one of the leading collaborationists of and apologists for the Soviet Union," and a fellow speaker at "a Communist sponsored youth rally."

Perhaps this Rev. Dr. McKenna is best known, however, for the role he has played as a leader of a group of about 50 Americans, who traveled to Communist China in direct defiance of a State Department ruling in 1957.

The State Department labeled the group, "a willing tool of Communist propaganda intended, wherever possible, to subvert the foreign policy and the best interests of the United States." McKenna, a leading organizer who handled preparations with the Red Chinese for the trip, was one of 15 in the group who received an all-expense-paid trip to and from China. McKenna was outstanding in his efforts to organize the American delegation when it appeared in Peiping on August 23, waving the Stars and Stripes in greeting to the vice president of the Chinese group.

I would like to emphasize that very few Mississippi Negroes, in spite of what you say and what you hear, approve the drastic demagogic measures employed by the delta ministry. In fact, in this very instance thousands were exhorted to

join the venture going from Homestead to Greenville Air Force Base, but only about 50 or so identifiable Mississippians were in the group violating the law of the land. Most of these motley crowds were out-of-State crackpots, both Negro and white, who were indulging in the dangerous game of lawlessness.

Regretfully, these misfits are promoting the cause of communism by simply encouraging the ignorant to undermine the law of our land. Whether their actions are overt or covert, they could not serve the Communist cause more effectively.

Rank and file Mississippi Negroes are primarily interested in living in peace and making a living for their families. They do not have the time or the inclination to join in these useless and worthless deeds, even though encouraged to do so by the liberal racketeers who are motivated politically and are seeking to destroy the peace and tranquillity of the State of Mississippi and the Southern States.

It is tragic that people who have lived in Mississippi all their lives are victimized by ambitious politicians from New York and other parts of the country in order to reelect them to Congress year after year. I think the time has come when American citizens should demand a moratorium on racial agitation. You have passed all of the civil rights bills anybody could possibly dream up. Why agitate? We should stop a while and evaluate the damage that could come to our great Nation if professional racists continue to run amuck with full immunity from prosecution on the part of the Federal Government.

When that time arrives, when they can flout the law—obey the laws that they want to obey and refuse to obey those that they do not agree with—then our investment in southeast Asia, in opposing Communist aggression, will have been lost. It is stupid to fight communism overseas when we are about to be overrun at home in a wave of contempt for law and order. If forces such as those led by the Council of Churches at Greenville—and the gentleman asked if we thought that was a leftwing organization. Let me say that if you look at the preachments of the National Council of Churches, there is no other conclusion that any objective study could reach. Of course it is leftwing.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly I yield.

Mr. RESNICK. Would the gentleman say what his distinguished colleague from Mississippi refused to say? You are stating in a flat statement, and may I assume you are reasonable, sober, and objective, that the National Council of Churches is a leftwing organization?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman heard what I said.

Mr. RESNICK. I am asking for a flat statement. I assume that you are a reasonable, sober person. I believe that is a reasonable and fair assumption. You are damning the National Council of Churches by innuendo. Either they are or they are not—in your opinion. You

cannot be sued when you say it in the well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will answer the question flatly with a yes or no answer when the gentleman answers this question: Is the John Birch Society subversive?

Mr. RESNICK. I believe it is, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Answer yes or no.

Mr. RESNICK. I believe it is, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You qualified it by saying you believed it.

Mr. RESNICK. I will state my opinion. I believe that it is strong enough. In my opinion, the John Birch Society is a subversive society.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. I am not going to ask the gentleman on what his opinion is based, because I do not believe even he knows.

So far as the National Council of Churches is concerned, I stand on the remark I just made, that if anyone will study the advocacies and the actions of the National Council of Churches there is no other reasonable conclusion he could reach except that it is a leftwing organization.

Mr. RESNICK. I am asking for your own opinion. You asked my opinion, and I gave it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I answered you.

Mr. RESNICK. I want the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say it was subversive. I am not suggesting that. I said it was leftwing. What more do you want?

Mr. RESNICK. You are saying the National Council of Churches is a leftwing organization?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I say it is a leftwing organization.

Mr. RESNICK. Thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Insofar as I have knowledge of the National Council of Churches, based on their publications and their actions—and that is all I can say about them, and that is all you can say about the John Birch Society.

Mr. RESNICK. Fine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. RESNICK. So that point is settled, that you believe the National Council of Churches is a leftwing organization. I would like that in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman concludes I hope he will yield to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman is trying to get that in the RECORD, with reference to me, I made statements all over Mississippi regarding that last fall. That does not bother me. My people think it is, too.

Mr. RESNICK. I should like to point out to the gentleman that I have no such intention. That is not my intention in this area. My intention is to bring out the facts.

I am grateful to the gentleman for corroborating my statement earlier, that there are Communists and there are leftwingers agitating based on the misery of these Negroes. I agree with that. That is one of the few accurate statements you have made.

For example, you indicate that I am the Congressman from the silk stocking district of New York. While I would love to have that fine position, I happen to represent a rural constituency in upstate New York.

I should also like to point out that according to the information which I got from the Department of Agriculture this afternoon, there is no cheese in the commodity list, so that your friend on your plantation must be going out and buying it. There is not even margarine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now the gentleman is trying to make me into a plantation owner. I do not even own a farm of any kind.

Mr. RESNICK. I would imagine he is going out and buying this good cheese so he can make you happy.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am trying to get through, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RESNICK. I believe the gentleman yielded to me. I should like to point out something else.

I understand that we were discussing in particular the delta region, which is not in the gentleman's district, but the gentleman feels that he may someday be a candidate for the Governor of Mississippi—

Mr. WILLIAMS. A part of the delta is in my district.

Mr. RESNICK. I stand corrected, then. I should like to point out to the gentleman, since I understand he is planning to run for Governor of the great State of Mississippi—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have heard the rumor.

Mr. RESNICK. I have heard the rumor, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I cannot verify it one way or another.

Mr. RESNICK. I heard the gentleman speak against the involvement of the Federal Government in the affairs of the State of Mississippi. When I was down there I just happened to read the proposed budget of the State of Mississippi for the next 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much more time do you plan to use? I have only 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. RESNICK. These are the facts and figures, sir. You are calling out against Federal involvement in Mississippi. I merely want to point out the budget of your State for the next 2 years is \$350,000—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further unless the gentleman compares that budget in actual round figures, with the budget of the State of New York, and does it here, without extending his remarks for that purpose.

Mr. RESNICK. I shall be happy to. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Since he knows all about the State of Mississippi.

Mr. RESNICK. I will put it in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You have all of the Mississippi figures, but you do not know a thing about New York.

Mr. RESNICK. I am calling for more Federal aid for New York. I want more Federal involvement. I want more Federal aid for the State of New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to my friend from Mississippi. I am just about through.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will be glad to wait.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In closing, Mr. Speaker, this thing can be summed up pretty well.

The visit of the distinguished authority on the State of Mississippi who hails from the State of New York, the very wealthy industrialist from the rich section of New York, whose heart bleeds for the poor colored people of the State of Mississippi, none of whom, so far as I know, has ever been invited to come up to work in his factory, was probably best described in the editorial in the Vicksburg Evening Post which I am going to put in the RECORD. The title of it is, "A Young Politician at Work":

JOSEPH V. RESNICK, Democrat, Representative from the State of New York, who took his seat in Congress * * *

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I decline to yield.

Mr. RESNICK. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman has mentioned my name and has not mentioned it correctly. I believe the gentleman ought to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RESNICK. Thank you. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have to apologize for the typesetter at the Vicksburg Evening Post. I think you will concede that we are making reference to the same person.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I demand regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RESNICK. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I pointed out to the gentleman my correct name.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand regular order.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York made a point of order, and the Chair will hear the point of order.

Mr. RESNICK. I pointed out to the gentleman my correct name, and I think in parliamentary usage, and I understand that courtesy is one of the traits they value so highly in the South, I think the least that the gentleman from Mississippi can do is he can be courteous enough to use my proper name.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know what the gentleman's proper name is. I am

reading from an article that appeared in a newspaper.

Mr. RESNICK. I point out once again that my name is JOSEPH Y. RESNICK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right. Mr. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, if you will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am going ahead and read this, and then I will quit.

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Evening Post, Dec. 3, 1965]

A YOUNG POLITICIAN AT WORK

JOSEPH V. RESNICK, Democrat, Representative from the State of New York, who took his seat in the Congress last January, has completed a 2-day "investigation" into the handling of Federal farm programs in Mississippi. Congressman RESNICK's conclusions, given to the press, were quite as expected.

In analyzing his short tour in our State, the only conclusion to be drawn is that here was a young politician at work, and his foray into Mississippi was beamed to his constituents in New York, where it is still quite fashionable to make Mississippi a target. That gets votes back in his district.

To have been objective in his "investigation," Mr. RESNICK would have had the courtesy, at least, of contacting his fellow Members of Congress from the State, but of course, as he voted to unseat them in the Congress, that would not have been proper to the voters back home. Then, too, he might have contacted some of the officials of our State, particularly the officials who handle the agricultural stabilization program. But then, he would not have gotten the answers he wanted. What he did was to come at the behest of the Freedom Democratic Party, was shown only that which this party wanted to show him, so he could sound off against the entire State of Mississippi, even though he visited only four counties.

It would be trite to say Mr. RESNICK should concern himself with the problems in his own district. But that is not the point. Mississippi has her faults, but she still welcomes those who come to our State to give an objective view of the entire situation. On the other hand, there is no welcome for anyone who comes with an entirely closed mind—one who has already prejudged our State—one who endeavors to make political hay out of a State about which he knows little, and probably cares less. Two days. How could he be objective? This was one mission which was completely and thoroughly political and, from the statements made, even a blind man should see through duplicity.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I say in my experience here we have seen many examples of this. I had a friend some years ago in the Midwest who ran against the TVA which happened to be about 1,000 miles from his county and his district. I was very fond of him, but he was reared as a politician and did not have to answer for any of the problems there. He just ran against TVA which was 1,000 miles away.

I know when our colleagues take on the South and take on our situation, as they have here today, with advance notice, that when we respond to them we are contributing to what they wanted in the first instance, namely, agitation. I know that the invitation to fly down tomorrow would not do anything to solve anything, but it would bring in the

press and all of that. We recognize it for what it is. But there does come a time when we are obligated to make an effort at least to keep this RECORD from carrying a completely erroneous state of facts.

I live in this area, and I have, in 25 years by the end of this year, tried to help solve the problems in my district, and when requested I have tried to help those in other areas. This last fall I did go—and I see the distinguished Speaker here, who will verify this—our Committee on Appropriations provided for a study of the wholesale marketing facilities in the cities of Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago. Last fall I visited those areas. I went into the harbor of New York where they have a terrible situation. It has built up over the years. As I said earlier, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] was running for mayor, and he described the pitiful situation in Harlem. I went there, and it was like he said it was. However, I did not issue any news releases. Goodness knows they had all the problems that they could solve themselves. But I recommended to our committee that we support the school lunch program. As I said earlier, we increased the money for the food stamp program, also. Now we are engaged in hearings that will improve the school lunch program and the milk program even more than they would be if the budget goes through as it is.

What I am trying to say is that this is a professional group, according to the record. Television cameras were there. This was a Federal installation. The demands were made on President Johnson.

Now let us get back to how commodities are handled. As I said earlier, I have had the privilege of being chairman of this committee for 15 years. Commodities are distributed throughout the country, including my State, by the Department of Agriculture.

They have several programs where these responsibilities are divided, and the local people pay the cost.

Since I have been here I have had this understanding with the Secretary of Agriculture. He had difficulty in one county. In that county the board of supervisors did not want to pay for the distribution, because no one could hire anyone to work.

Mr. Speaker, after I went to Harlem and have been elsewhere, if you can make it easy enough, you will have a hard job getting some people to work, and that is true in my area, as well as elsewhere.

But in this case they could not get people to work at all. The board of supervisors did get behind the question of distribution.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman called me, and I called the chairman, and told him that the Federal Government was going to distribute the commodities unless you do this. I told him that I was in sympathy with him. But the board has its orders. They said they would be glad to do so. I know that commodities, through regular channels, have been made available, and I know the Department did advise me in my area

with reference to this. In this instance all of the outward appearances are to the effect that the Delta ministry is in a contest as to who is going to get Federal money and who is going to handle it. If one does not believe our statements, one will see that there is more demand for them to have money than anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I will say it again, and I will back it up, there is not a city in the United States that would have acted quicker to provide people with food than Greenville, Miss., had they been requested.

Mr. Speaker, this was planned days ahead. Television cameras were set up there.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], will want to correct his remarks when he said that the Federal troops used bayonets on these people. Anyone who saw the television pictures knows that these were Federal air patrols. They carefully left out any signs of weapons.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], wish me to yield to the gentleman at this time?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman will recall my statement, I said "at gunpoint." There was no mention of "bayonets."

Mr. WHITTEN. But the gentleman does say that guns were used?

Mr. RESNICK. I do believe that. I saw pictures, and there were guns.

Mr. WHITTEN. The Air Force said they did not use guns. I know they said they tried to keep from it.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like the RECORD to be clear. I did not mention bayonets.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, certainly, I would want the gentleman's remarks to speak for themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can state categorically that these soldiers were not armed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go one step further. I used to be a district attorney, and I will match my record for fairness, regardless of race, with anyone in the country, and my State is the same way. But we have had less trouble in the past 5 years than our northern cities have had, and I sympathize with them, but I did not issue any statement at the time I was present in these northern areas as to their conditions.

However, when it comes to the public works appropriation, I do my very best to help these northern areas to solve the problems which they have. So help me, in some of our bigger cities it is almost unsolvable. I have been reading the statements in the press, and note that there is a great demand on the part of the city of New York by the people of the city of New York, and a great demand

upon the Federal Government for assistance, and there is a great argument that this aid to poverty is sticking to the hands of those handling it, and that the poor are not receiving it.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to run for Congress in New York, anyone could see through this. I believe my friends will find that to jump on a situation 1,000 miles away or 1,500 miles away, is not going to fool any people up there, especially when they had to bypass Harlem and New York City in order to get to Mississippi for a period of 3 days.

I do not know what the gentleman was told with reference to what he said here. I do not know the source of his information. However, you learn not to believe his source of information, although they are well known, but not favorably.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] decides whether he wants me to yield—

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] mentioned my name, and I believe congressional courtesy demands that he yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just hold your horses for a minute.

Before the gentleman from Mississippi decides whether he wishes me to yield to the gentleman from New York, I want to set the gentleman from New York straight on one thing. Here is an Associated Press article, written by John Hall of the Associated Press, datelined Greenville, Miss., printed in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News under date of February 1, 1966, as follows:

GREENVILLE, MISS.—The Air Force flew more than 100 officers and airmen into its deactivated Greenville base early today to counter an invasion by a band of Negro squatters.

"We will secure the base from further demonstrators," said Maj. George Henrikusk, an Air Force information officer. "Under no circumstances will our men be equipped with weapons."

Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] wish me to yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RESNICK. You had better take a look at the pictures. But I would like to inquire from the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi who asked me: Is the information I was told, told to me by these agitators, these leftwingers, these Communists?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where did the gentleman get his information about weapons?

Mr. WHITTEN. Is the gentleman asking me? Whoever told you is carrying it too far.

Mr. RESNICK. Is the gentleman inferring that I was told this by these various Communist organizations that your colleague read off? Are you inferring that I got my information from other than Government sources?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have to infer it because I am just going according to the press.

Mr. RESNICK. Will the gentleman agree, if he is interested in getting the actual facts on this thing, will the gentleman join with me in asking for a conference tomorrow with Under Secretary

Schnittker? I may be wrong. I would like the gentleman to be there. The gentleman does not wish to go to Greenville, Miss., at my expense so therefore I suggest that we convene a conference with Under Secretary Schnittker, and Sargent Shriver and Special Assistant Seabron who has just come back from Greenville, Miss., who stated that he could not get food delivered in Greenville, Miss. Will the gentleman join me in calling for a conference like that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say, the gentleman just confirmed what I suspected. I can get on the telephone and get the true story in 30 minutes. So can the gentleman. The gentleman is on the Committee on Agriculture. What he wants is a press conference. He wants to go to Greenville not to straighten anything out. He is like these people who took over this air base. They were the most disappointed people when they were not arrested and when they could not keep their pictures in the paper for a week. The gentleman can go over there right now. He can go and call the Secretary and get the facts. But the gentleman has just indicated that that is not what he wants. I said at the start that I regret getting into this kind of altercation here because that is exactly what my colleague wanted. But soon you get to where you have to have the facts presented to show the true story.

Mr. Speaker, as I attempted to point out in my colloquy with my colleague, Congressman RESNICK, of New York, I understand that he spent probably 3 days in four or more counties of Mississippi at the invitation of a group which has insisted on creating turmoil in every direction. Doubtless his information came from them.

Actually, however, the election of ASC committeemen was the subject of supervision and a check by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as well as other branches of the Federal Government. While Congressman RESNICK complains about the number of candidates, which he says split the vote in some instances, I wonder what statement he would have made if for any reason Negroes and others had not been candidates. He complains that they let everybody run who wanted to run.

Congressman RESNICK has not discussed with me any of his findings, nor has he given me any information regarding the Greenville incident of last week. Greenville is one of the finest cities in the country. According to information given me, the efforts to move in on a Federal reservation and demands that the land be divided among the interlopers were spearheaded by a group which demanded that President Johnson do as they desired and distribute to them, funds, lands, et cetera. Their removal from the property by Federal authorities is comparable to the action taken by the Government when a group of white people moved in on the White House last year, with the exception that the Federal Government arrested the offenders in the latter instance and has

not done so with this group which took similar action in Greenville.

According to the Justice Department, names and addresses of those who moved in on the Air Force base at Greenville could not be obtained; nor was the FBI able to get this information. It might be noted that the Department of Justice twice told the group that if they were truly homeless Mr. Katzenbach and the Department would see that their problems were met. Apparently they have homes and just want trouble, for to date no one has supplied the necessary information.

It was thought for a time that the Greenville Air Force Base takeover would be delayed because there was some question as to whether the television cameras could get there on time. They made it, however, and the show went on as planned.

Last fall I visited New York City, the 14th Street markets and the downtown slum areas, including much of Harlem. I was there in connection with a study and plans developed by the Federal Government to improve food distribution in wholesale markets and to reduce the cost of food to the consumer. Funds for the initial planning involved are appropriated on the recommendation of the Appropriations Subcommittee of which I am chairman. Our findings as a result of the study with regard to food marketing, methods of decreasing costs of distribution and handling in wholesale markets have been used by the cities in designing and constructing facilities. I am pleased to see that, as deplorable as conditions have been in the wholesale market level in New York City, Chicago, and elsewhere, they are taking advantage of these plans.

We also toured New York Harbor in connection with our public works appropriations assignment, and are glad to try to help meet the problems of all sections of the country. I certainly do not wish to embarrass my colleagues and friends from these other areas. Suffice it to say, they have so many problems it is easy to understand why they are asking for help for New York City from the New York State government, as well as from the Federal Government.

Many other sections of the country are also requesting help. Any visit to these areas and observation of conditions there make it easy to understand why Congressman RESNICK and others would try to direct attention of their local people to anyplace in the United States other than their own backyard, if thereby they can avoid having to deal with the problems which they have at home.

Of course, we have problems in the South, but they are small as compared with those of the slum areas of the northern cities. Mechanization is changing the work patterns of Mississippi agriculture. Actually, since the beginning of the war in Vietnam it has been difficult to get anyone to work on a farm. The various government programs enable so many to get by without work that the incentive to work is gradually being removed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] supported the farm bill. I thought it better to

have a farm bill calling for production and making our commodities available on the counters of the markets of the world for use by those who need them than to pay to stop agriculture.

I served as district attorney of my State for 8½ years and will match not only my record but the record of the people of Mississippi in dealing with our problems with that of any person or any section of the Nation. We have had some occurrences which we deplore. Numerically they are few, less over a period of a number of years than those on one week-end in many cities of the country.

In my experience in Congress I have never tried to make any capital with regard to the other fellow's problems, but I have devoted my time to trying to solve our own. I think this the proper approach for any Member of Congress.

Those who have spoken today about conditions in Mississippi should talk to people who have an overall knowledge and an objective outlook, rather than to individuals with records for creating turmoil such as those with whom Mr. Resnick has dealt. And, may I say, if they wait until their section of the country gets its problems in the same area corrected before they jump on mine, they will never jump.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUEST

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of special orders today, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I object.

Earlier a request was made and we called attention to the hour. I think it is unfair at this time. I might add to be fair about it, the gentleman from California had time in debate earlier and it is quite apparent what would happen here. I have an appointment or at least I had an appointment about 30 minutes ago that I have to go to, so, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, is the House going to be in session tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the House will be in session tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency. I most certainly share the concern expressed by a number of my colleagues with the alarming rise in automobile deaths on our highways, and I hope through this measure to join in an effort to significantly reduce the loss of life and property through accidents.

During 1965 nearly 50,000 Americans lost their lives as a result of traffic accidents, 793 of these in the State of Iowa alone. In the past 25 years over a million and one-half Americans have died in motor vehicle accidents, this is more than twice as many as have died in all the wars the Nation has fought since its founding nearly 200 years ago. As the number of miles driven in an automobile-conscious society increases each year, and the danger of driving each mile grows, so too will the tragic toll of lives needlessly lost rise accordingly unless we begin to recognize traffic safety as a matter of vital national concern, and take effective steps to lessen the probability of crippling accidents.

The broad range of local and State traffic enforcement activities in the face of the constantly expanding rate of interstate travel and the shocking national death level make it clear that this critical problem closely affects all levels of government as well as each individual automobile operator and producer. All must, therefore, properly join in a concerted effort to meet and overcome the intolerably high accident rate.

Though the number of traffic fatalities in Iowa last year was staggering, I am pleased to note that the vigorous administrative activities and intensified enforcement efforts of the department of public safety assisted in actually reducing the figure from the total of the previous year. If this hopeful trend is to continue in the State, however, and similar reductions are to be realized on a nationwide basis, we should act now to facilitate a greater coordination of information and activities, to insure the widespread application of existing knowledge, and to promote a more uniform acceptance of proven safety standards.

Investigations such as the recently completed automotive safety hearings in Des Moines, clearly indicate that we have too long placed insufficient emphasis on the vital factor of automotive design and production to insure that the Ameri-

can motorist is adequately protected by the most effective safety devices that our enormous resources and modern research proficiency are capable of providing. In this area the Federal Government should act to develop and clearly define minimum safety standards for the production of automobiles, just as it has in past years established standards governing the production of other modes of transportation. While 5 persons die for every 10 billion miles traveled by train, 13 for each 10 billion miles traveled by bus, and 14 for every 10 billion air miles, a distressing 570 persons die for every 10 billion miles traveled by automobile. Yet, we have not established minimum safety standards for automobiles as has been done for planes, trains, and buses.

These standards could then be readily complied with by automobile manufacturers without the confusion which would otherwise result if each State were to independently establish its own requirements.

Moreover, motorists would be assured of encountering vehicles meeting required safety standards on the roads of any State where they travel.

The legislation I have introduced would establish a national traffic safety program to conduct research and investigation in all relevant areas of traffic safety, encourage the enactment and enforcement of uniform State traffic and licensing laws, and develop and establish national traffic safety standards. The bill would also provide for the certification of motor vehicle manufacturers whose vehicles were designed to meet national safety performance standards. Additionally, grants would be authorized for State safety agencies to assist in the establishment and expansion of programs for the improvement of driver education and licensing, motor vehicle inspection, accident reporting, and highway design, construction, and marking.

I hope that the Congress will act in this important field during the months ahead. With the enactment of appropriate legislation, I feel we can successfully focus greater national attention on the matter of automobile and traffic safety and direct the best national leadership and coordinating ability to stemming the awful tide of destruction on our highways.

AERIAL GARBAGE AND AIR SAFETY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the numerous speeches I have delivered on the floor of the House over the past several years on the subject of air safety I have often referred to the problem of the near collision, or near-miss as some prefer. Near collisions occur for a number

of reasons, none of them good ones. Sometimes near collisions turn into real collisions. So the problem is a deadly serious one.

Among the causes of near collisions I have cited in the past the failure of the FAA to set forth rules providing for adequate vertical and horizontal separation, the inadequacy or absence of navigational and other aids at airports, the faulty radar monitoring of aircraft at FAA control centers, congestion in and around airports, and the improper observation and reporting of weather conditions by the FAA and the U.S. Weather Bureau.

Those of my colleagues who share my concern for aviation safety will be interested in another cause of near collisions, among other things, closely related to the problem of the incorrect reporting of weather conditions, is the problem of aerial garbage.

Aerial garbage, also known as air pollution, clutters the skies above the Nation's urban centers sometimes reaching as high as 31,000 feet according to the airline pilots who have to cope with it. Pilots have long recognized aerial garbage as a source of annoyance and danger. This garbage, a mixture of soot and dirt, does not dissipate in sunshine. It hovers and moves with the weather. It is plainly distinct from haze, which is a composition of salt crystals or dust, and does dissipate in sunshine. It is important to the pilot of a plane, not to speak of his passengers, to know whether he was about to fly into haze or into aerial garbage.

But according to Capt. O. M. Cokes, director of air safety for the Airline Pilot's Association, the U.S. Weather Bureau incorrectly reports aerial garbage as haze. Further, and most significantly, Captain Cokes states that near collisions have increased as a result of aerial garbage "to a point where you have had a dull trip if you don't experience at least one on every sequence as a scheduled airline pilot."

This quotation and other facts concerning aerial garbage are reported in the February 12 issue of the New Republic in an article written by Leticia. This article goes on to describe how another airline pilot, Capt. William L. Guthrie, a 35-year veteran, has challenged the FAA to exercise its responsibility to investigate pilot allegations of incorrect weather reports.

The problem of near collisions and of air safety generally, is serious enough to warrant the full attention of the responsible Federal agencies. I have stated in the past that in my opinion aviation safety was being neglected by those agencies that have the duty of maintaining and improving it. The FAA, for example, has gotten pretty far into the business of developing the supersonic transport. I do not quarrel with this activity. But it seems to me that before millions and hundreds of millions of dollars are set aside for the development of a new plane that we use every resource to insure the safety of the ones we have. I cannot overemphasize the problem of the near collision. I have stated before and I state now that if the traveling

public were fully aware of the incredible number of near collisions that occur daily the impact would be immediate and the effects on air travel would be substantial. We have seen instances where planes have collided or almost collided because of lack of proper equipment, or lack of adequate guidelines for vertical or horizontal separation, or because of faulty weather reporting, or for other reasons. But each of these faults and inadequacies can be corrected and should be corrected.

The traveling public has the right to fly under the safest possible conditions, not under conditions which are thought to be safe enough, or safe compared to other modes of travel as computed by some statistical method—but under the safest possible conditions. In my opinion, the conditions of air travel could be made considerably safer than they are today.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the article from the New Republic by Leticia Kent.

AERIAL GARBAGE

"Smoking is going to kill us just as sure as the sun comes up in the east (whether or not we can see it) regardless of what the American Medical Association or tobacco experts say. Not cigarette smoking, pipe smoking, or cigars, but the unscrupulous dumping of garbage in the atmosphere. If I sound like I'm off on some kind of a crusade kick, that is only because I am, namely, to see if I can't hit a sensitive nerve in someone's conscience who will have the guts to stand up and be counted by turning the first wheel some place, some way, to put a stop to air pollution before it kills us all, not on the ground but in the air."

So began a recent letter from an airline pilot, Capt. O. M. Cokes, to the Airline Pilots' Association's director of air safety. The letter asserted that near collisions between aircraft have increased because of smoke pollution "to a point where you have had a dull trip if you don't experience at least one on every sequence as a scheduled airline pilot." The letter went on to accuse the U.S. Weather Bureau of incorrectly reporting the smoke as haze. The official glossary of the Bureau, it said, defines haze, a natural phenomenon, as "salt crystals or dust" and does not include "smoke" in that definition. Smoke is a mixture of soot and dirt. Haze-based fog dissipates quickly in sunshine; smoke-based fog does not.

For years, a pilots' campaign, inspiring letters like Cokes', has been conducted by Capt. William L. Guthrie, pilot and renowned clear air buff. During the recent New York mayoralty race, Guthrie conferred with both the Ryan and Lindsay teams, to no noticeable effect except that the candidates began to allude to "aerial garbage." For years, Guthrie has seen from his cockpit that there exists, nationwide, a blanket of smoke reaching as high as 31,000 feet, which moves with major weather systems. He believes that public efforts to prevent air pollution (such as smoke) cannot begin until the problem is accurately stated and assignment of responsibility correctly made.

Guthrie's allegations (corroborated by 2,300 fellow Eastern Airlines pilots) remain uncontested; but his correspondence and messages to the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting review of inaccurate weather reporting, remain unanswered.

On October 7, Captain Guthrie refused flightdeck access to an FAA inspector. FAA inspectors, representing the public interest, conduct routine en route airline checks and are entitled to access to the pilot's compartment of the aircraft during flight. Guthrie

considered that the FAA lacked concern for the public interest in failing to investigate pilot allegations of incorrect weather reports. A disciplined airline pilot with an enviable 35-year record, he apparently deliberately violated Federal aviation regulations. He was grounded, but has appealed the ruling.

"The airline pilot," Guthrie says, "privileged with a front seat from which to view the ever-changing and ever-dirtier sky, has a special interest in demanding correct weather reports. Once smoke is consistently identified, it can be stopped at its source and responsibility for it can be established. By the time pollution gets into the air, there's no way to control it."

"If the Federal Government will simply take the position that the dumping of private property (waste material) in the Nation's sky is undesirable, and set a time schedule of dumping penalties as a deterrent, we will see the ingenuity of our industrial machine producing a clear sky."

"If aerial dumping of waste is severely penalized," Guthrie continued, "then billions of dollars worth of retention and salvage equipment will be designed, manufactured, sold, installed, serviced, replaced by better equipment."

Guthrie's suggestions have already been successfully tried in the town of Palm Beach Shores in Florida, which enacted a 1964 ordinance penalizing aerial dumpers \$20 per ton. When this was done, the local powerplant quickly announced it would convert from residual fuel oil to natural gas, thereby lessening aerial contamination (but not eliminating it). More recently the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended "that careful study be given to taxlike systems in which all polluters would be subject to 'effluent charges' in proportion to their contribution to pollution." Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is interested in offering economic incentives for pollution abatement. Urban critic Jane Jacobs foresees the rise of a new growth industry in our cities concerned with retention and salvage of wastes. Someday, despite depressing indications to the contrary, the problem of aerial garbage may be solved.

THE DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL GUARD DELIVERS TO VIETNAM CARGO VITAL TO THE DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Delaware Air National Guard has just completed another flight to Vietnam delivering cargo vital to the defense of freedom, according to Lt. Col. Forest C. Shoup, its commanding officer.

This flight makes the seventh mission since December 1, 1965, in which Delawareans and their neighbors from Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New Jersey have given freely of their time and talent to carry out a task of major importance.

I take this occasion to commend the members of the Delaware Air National Guard who participated in this mission on a voluntary basis and who took time from their civilian jobs and their families to support the Regular military Air

Force in transporting vital materiel to Vietnam. I include as part of my remarks the following letter from Lt. Col. Forest C. Shoup:

142D MILITARY AIRLIFT SQUADRON,
DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL GUARD,
New Castle, Del., January 29, 1966.

Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: I am happy to inform you that the Delaware Air National Guard has just completed another flight to Vietnam delivering cargo vital to the defense of freedom.

The men listed below participated in this mission on a voluntary basis taking time from their civilian jobs and families to support the regular military Air Force in transporting materiel to the Far East.

This flight marks the seventh mission since December 1, 1965, in which Delawareans and their neighbors from Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New Jersey have given freely of their time and talent to accomplish a job that must be done.

Best regards,

Forest C. Shoup, Lt. Col., Delaware Air National Guard, Aircraft Commander;
Capt. James A. Moore, 1st Pilot, Havertown, Pa.; Capt. Jack K. Bal, 1st Pilot, Riverside, N.J.; Maj. Hugh P. Goettel, Instructor Navigator, Wilmington, Del.; Capt. Jay R. Herr, Crew Navigator, Lancaster, Pa.; 2d Lt. James R. Sisson, Student Navigator, Media, Pa.; M. Sgt. Floren McNichols, AF Adviser, Wilmington, Del.; M. Sgt. John Weber, Flight Engineer, Wilmington, Del.; T. Sgt. Scott Rice, Flight Engineer, University of Delaware; T. Sgt. Bernard W. Coll, Loadmaster, Wilmington, Del.

TOM ADAMS AND THE NATION'S WATERWAYS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there is being held in Washington at the present time a conference by the Mississippi Valley Association attended by over a thousand people whose interests and livelihoods are vitally concerned with the development and utilization of the Nation's waterways.

One of the principal speakers was to be Florida's very capable secretary of state, Tom Adams. Unfortunately he will be unable to be present because of illness. However, and fortunately, he has previously made a very able presentation of the value of waterways to the Nation's economy and of the threat to them represented by a proposal which looms large in the future welfare of inland and intracoastal waterways and the shippers, industries and citizens so dependent upon them—user charges or tolls.

The National Waterways Conference, Inc., of which Tom Adams has been president since 1961, has been sponsoring regional conferences of waterways users and other interested persons at which their problems and future are discussed.

On January 19, 1966, Tom Adams was the principal speaker at such a conference in Little Rock. His address, which I strongly recommend to your attention, has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1966 on page 1721, by Representative CLAUDE PEPPER.

This address was a very able exposition of the multipurpose development of the Nation's water resources, of the full-scale development of river basins for flood control, water supply, hydro-power, fish and wildlife enhancement, water pollution abatement, recreation, and navigation.

Complete development, to be economically sound must include all of these interrelated and interdependent purposes.

The proposal to impose user charges or tolls on waterways could upset the delicate relationships and possibly cause irreparable damage to an important segment of the Nation's transportation system which handles over 10 percent of all of the country's freight and upon which a sizable portion of its population depends for a regulator of transportation costs.

The administration is again proposing to initiate toll charges in the form of a tax of 2 cents per gallon on fuel used by shallow draft commercial vessels.

Tom Adams asserts that such a tax or toll on the waterways would not serve the best interests of the general public or the Nation. He holds they would raise water freight charges, thus reducing traffic, and affecting other aspects of water resource development; such as, flood control and water supply. This would result in reducing the economic benefits. The future of many areas in the Nation which are heavily dependent upon these waterways could be jeopardized. This is most particularly true in the large areas served by the 22,000 miles of inland and intracoastal waterways but would affect to some degree the whole country.

Tom Adams is well qualified to speak on the subject. He has been a farmer, thus a user of waterways; served magnificently in the State senate where he was chosen as the outstanding freshman senator in 1957, and most valuable member of the 1959 session of the legislature.

His long and sustained interest in and study of water resource development was climaxed in 1959 when he was appointed to the U.S. Commission, Southeast River Basins. Upon becoming secretary of state of Florida in 1961 he was named the most effective State administrator.

Tom Adams was active in the organization of the National Waterways Conference, Inc. in 1960. This is composed of members of the Nation's basic industries—oil, chemical, iron and steel and grain companies who use waterways of public industrial development agencies, port authorities and other local government bodies; of water carriers and waterway service industries. All are essential cogs in the economic machinery of our Nation and their welfare, development and prosperity is basic to that of the Nation at large.

The address made by Tom Adams, one which I strongly recommend to you, is a very cogent and purposeful delineation of the problem and its solution by one eminently qualified to do so.

AGRICULTURE FAILS TO GET A FAIR AND EQUITABLE SHARE OF THE NEW BUDGET

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line those who formulated the budget have gotten their signals crossed.

On the one hand there are White House proposals for more effective educational programs. On the other a reduction is proposed in the school milk program fund. How, by any stretch of the imagination, can it be presumed that hungry youngsters can learn at a normal rate.

On the one hand there are predictions that our rural areas will soon be required to produce at an expanded rate to meet the growing food needs of the world. On the other we see a proposal for the reduction of funds in the soil conservation program. This is an important part of the plan for the development of maximum productivity in the future. It does not seem to me that we are being far-sighted enough in our program planning. Certainly the programs of the past that have been proved successful should not be brushed aside so that new and untried programs can get a start.

Further evidence that agriculture fails to get a fair and equitable share of this new budget is found in the drastic cut in the REA loan program—a program that makes little demand on our Federal resources because the loans are returned with interest and the investment in powerlines adds to the growth and expansion of our rural economy. This brings in more revenue to meet Federal expenses and helps to reduce the pressures to increase taxes.

The budget recommendations ignore the annual survey of rural electric loan applications for fiscal 1967, which show a need of \$675 million, by seeking authorization of only \$220 million in new loan funds. This is one-third the amount required.

Adding to this curtailment of future credit requirements affecting some 10 percent of our population is the curtailment of current authorizations already made by this Congress. This cut amounts to a total of \$132 million. Despite the growing volume of loan applications \$35 million of current loan authorization has been impounded. Further, \$60 million in contingency funds we voted at the last session are to be lost and will not be available to reduce the current program loan needs. Finally some \$37 million of 1965 contingency funds released by the Budget Bureau only after repeated demands by Members of this House are being impounded. It is proposed that some of these funds be held

for use in both fiscal 1967 and 1968. The need is now—not a year or so hence. The Congress is aware of this loan need and in its judgment made provision to meet it. Now we learn that the problem is compounded and increased because of Budget Bureau restrictions.

Can this "brownout" of REA credit funds be allowed to grow into a "black-out" for rural and farm areas? How can a farmer plan to go all-electric in adopting new feed programs to step up his animal units if he cannot get a larger transformer, a larger distribution line, a new substation to feed the growing demand for energy required by him and his neighbors? How can our farmers grow the additional supplies for any international attack on hunger if they cannot get the basic electric energy to increase production, lower costs, and offset labor shortages?

Private utilities announce that their construction investments will soar to \$4.8 billion in the year ahead. Rural and farm people are power minded too. If rural areas are to move forward, if they are to respond to President Johnson's efforts to improve the rural economy, they will need growth and improvement in their electric and telephone systems to be competitive. We hear of plans to organize rural districts through which development of rural plans can be coordinated and moved forward. Yet the Budget Bureau proposes to slash REA credit and slow down the resources of rural America to have adequate, basic electric service.

Again, REA credit is not a "cost" but an investment. If squeeze we must, let's squeeze on doubtful proposals whose value is questionable. Rural electric loans add to the rural economy and expand the tax base and to that extent lessen the pressures for increasing tax rates.

These rural electric systems, nearly 1,000 stretched across this land of ours, are serving some 10 percent of the population. If they are starved for capital funds this large and important segment of our economy will be seriously hurt.

If the budget cut in REA loan authorizations applied across the Nation on an equal basis, the amount of credit available for the additional facilities needed by Iowa rural electric consumers' would be about \$5 per user, or \$750,000 for the 48 operating distribution systems which have an investment of a quarter of a billion dollars. It is just simply not realistic to think the proposed limited appropriation comes anywhere meeting the need.

Rural electric borrowers themselves have taken steps to try and solve this problem through supplementary financial proposals of their own. However, it takes time to get such plans into effective operation. I am pleading for adequate funds now to enable the rural electric systems to keep abreast of their responsibilities until alternative plans can be set up and become workable. Additionally I suggest that a serious analysis be made of the reductions proposed by the Bureau of the Budget in a variety of basic programs and their effect on rural life in America.

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL REDWOODS PARK

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, similar to that by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], to create a Redwoods National Park in northern California. In submitting this legislation to the House, I want to emphasize the importance of size and location, in establishing a true Redwoods Park.

Anyone who has been fortunate enough to stand for a moment among the tall and majestic redwoods of California and see the light rays filter down between the trees can only support legislation to create a Redwoods National Park to sustain this sight for an urban America which increasingly flees to such natural areas for relaxation and regeneration.

But this is accepted—the need to conserve our forests and rivers and sights has not been a debatable proposition since the days of our esteemed and energetic President Theodore Roosevelt. The question of conflict revolves instead around whether we are to preserve the best of what we have.

This bill proposes that a redwood park be established along Prairie and Redwood Creeks in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties. This site is far superior to others which have been suggested. First because it includes the largest remaining concentration of virgin redwoods with both major groves and record trees. Over half of the 90,000 acres proposed is virgin growth. This is significant as we realize that only 200,000 acres are left of the original 2 million.

This area would provide a balanced park with diversified recreational opportunities—18 miles of coastline and 22 miles of Redwood Creek, valleys, and forests. It is recommended by the National Geographic Society, the major conservation organizations and a year ago was the first choice of the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will recognize the very great benefits of this bill which will establish a national park in a region which still boasts of the beauty and naturalness which we are attempting to preserve. I urge my colleagues' support of H.R. 12711.

NOTIFYING THE NEXT OF KIN

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter and a copy of an editorial from Howard White, a constituent of the Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina, and editor of the Burlington, N.C., Daily-Times News.

Mr. White's letter and editorial pointed to a situation which concerns me very deeply. He criticized a procedure followed by the Department of Defense in notifying next of kin of the death of a serviceman.

In his editorial, Mr. White described how a bereaved mother was notified of the death of her son. A commercial taxi driver drove to her home at night and calmly and impersonally handed her a telegram which contained the shocking news that her son had been killed.

I am writing to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to suggest, as does Mr. White, that there must be a better way to inform the next of kin that their loved ones are dead.

We owe those who have made the great sacrifice of a son or husband more than this. They deserve more respect than this cold knock on the door by a cabbie. They have given their most precious possession to their country. Can their country not give them the respect, the understanding, and compassion they deserve?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree with Mr. White. There must be a better way.

For the benefit of my colleagues, who I know will be as concerned as I am in this matter, I would like to include in my remarks a copy of a letter I am dispatching to Secretary McNamara, as well as copies of Mr. White's letter and editorial:

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to call your attention to a situation which concerns me deeply, as I know it will you.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Howard White, editor of the Daily Times-News in Burlington, N.C., along with a clipping from the editorial page of his newspaper. (Copies of Mr. White's letter and accompanying editorial are attached herewith.)

Mr. White, in his letter and in his editorial, asks the very timely and cogent question: Is there not "a better way" to notify next of kin of the death of a serviceman?

I am hopeful that the procedure outlined in the Times-News editorial is an isolated instance and not generally used to notify a mother of the death of her son—or daughter. The thought of an impersonal taxi driver coldly delivering a death message to the home of the next of kin of an American serviceman is a chilling one to me.

I would not be so bold as to outline a better solution, for you and your subordinates are much better equipped to prescribe more suitable approaches to the problem than I am. I would only repeat Mr. White's plea for a "better way." There must be a better way to inform a mother or a wife of the most stunning and tragic news she can ever receive—that her son or husband has been killed. We owe them more than that, since they have made the great sacrifice of their loved one for his country. There has to be a "better way," one which entails the compassion, the humaneness, and understanding which the recipient of this woeful news deserves.

After you have read Mr. White's editorial, I am sure that you will agree with both of us. There must be a "better way." And,

with the increasing bitterness of the struggle in Vietnam, this matter becomes more important with every fatality occurring there.

Knowing of the many and heavy burdens that are yours now, I would be doubly appreciative of your consideration of this matter.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HORACE R. KORNEGAY.

THE DAILY TIMES-NEWS,
Burlington, N.C., February 5, 1966.

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HORACE: We ran into this situation again on procedure in notifying the next of kin.

I'm enclosing an editorial I had on yesterday's page.

It simply seems to me that there is a better way to handle this.

A knock on the door, a mother by herself in the house, a telegram, her son is dead. I'm sure that across the Nation there are many mothers who have been in danger themselves through such a practice, for all would not be without some degree of shock, and so forth.

This is a suggestion, for your consideration. Sincerely,

A. HOWARD WHITE.

[From the Burlington (N. C.) Daily Times-News, Feb. 4, 1966]

NOTIFYING THE NEXT OF KIN

The procedure of parents or next of kin being informed when a husband or son is killed while serving his country has not been changed.

But each time a telegram is delivered with such a message, there comes a big question. The conclusion which always comes is that it should be changed.

Western Union has followed a policy for several years, in agreement with the Department of Defense, that it delivers such messages. The simple requirement is that the telegram be delivered by a bona fide delivery service. A taxi that has insurance is an example of a qualifying service.

When the parents of Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland of Route 2, Graham, learned of his death by telegram Wednesday night, it was by telegram delivered by a taxi driver.

There must be some better way.

Isn't it possible, we can ask, that the Chaplain's Corps at Fort Bragg be given the message, and a chaplain, in turn be the one to knock at the door and reveal the news?

If that were not possible, could not the commander of our National Guard, or the head of our reserve unit, be responsible for such a service?

There are many possible approaches to making the notification adjust closer into the Nation's respect for its men in uniform, for those who pay the supreme sacrifice, than the highly impersonal use of a telegram delivered by a commercial service. There is something missing in this link of national respect and the family suffering a loss when there is merely a knock on the door, delivery of a telegram, and departure.

There could be problems in handling the notification in some other way.

But they cannot be larger than the problem created in the hearts and minds of people within a family, or neighbors and friends, on a nation accepting such a loss in such a routine, matter-of-fact way.

THE PRIVILEGED CLASS: STORES, GOVERNMENTS GIVE BREAKS TO THE ELDERLY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 28, the Wall Street Journal published a front-page article headlined "The Privileged Class: Stores, Governments Give Breaks to the Elderly."

The article described certain discounts being made available to Michigan's senior citizens including reduced fees for fishing licenses, half-price tickets to ball games, cutrate prices for bowling, lower property taxes on their homes, and special discounts, offered by some firms, for drugs and medicines.

Let me say right here that I am heartily in accord with such practices. Statistics on incomes, pensions, and so forth, illustrate only too graphically how difficult a time our retired citizens have in making ends meet, even with the benefit of such "privileges."

I was appalled then, to read in the Wall Street Journal article where the Michigan Board of Pharmacy has put a stop to the practice of offering a special drug discount to senior citizens on the grounds that it "discriminates" against younger people.

The executive secretary of the Michigan Board of Pharmacy, a Mr. Allan Weatherwax, is quoted as saying:

Old people can get free drugs through welfare and old-age assistance.

What an incredibly calloused remark.

Certainly it deserves to be ranked with the infamous retort of Marie Antoinette, who when told the people of France were crying for bread snapped: "Let them eat cake."

Because, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Weatherwax was asked to let this drug discount plan for senior citizens continue—so that they could meet their medical needs with dignity and independence from their own meager resources at no cost to the State—his response was: "Let them go on welfare."

This way, of course, they could get drugs but only after putting on their begging clothes and being stamped with the welfare stigma.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Wall Street Journal article to which I refer be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

THE PRIVILEGED CLASS: STORES, GOVERNMENTS GIVE BREAKS TO ELDERLY—SHOPS SAY PLANS OFTEN LEAD TO NEW ORDERS FROM YOUNG; DRUG FIRM RUNS INTO TROUBLE

(By Jerry Flint)

DETROIT.—Want to know how to get a discount on your taxes, a free checking account, a cheap fishing license, a cut rate on medicine, a half-price ticket to the ball game?

Here's how: Grow old.

It seems that nearly everybody is trying to help out the old folks these days. But it's not all as altruistic as it looks. "Many oldsters have children, and their children have children. The youngsters are very grateful for what we can do for their parents, and this leads to new business," says Charles Rosen, executive vice president of Revco Drug Stores, Inc., a big Midwest chain that gives people over age 60 a 10-percent discount on prescription drug prices.

And Marvin Criger, senior vice president of the bank of Dearborn, Mich., says the bank provides free checking accounts to older people because it wants to help them out. But he adds: "Their children are grown and live in this area, too. If we do something nice for the old folks, it's likely they'll say something nice about us to their children." He figures the free accounts cost the bank about \$1,000 a month.

A TAX BREAK

Whatever the reason, the number of privileges for this privileged class is definitely on the rise. In Michigan, the legislature last year enacted a law giving most homeowners over 65 a special discount on local home property taxes; the plan is expected to save the eligible homeowners an average of \$90 a year.

Delaware recently passed a property tax exemption for elderly homeowners earning \$3,000 a year or less. And Michigan cut the price of fishing licenses for oldsters to 50 cents from \$2, effective last month, and plans free dental service for the elderly.

In the Los Angeles area, people over 65 get special rates for Dodger and Angel baseball games, movies and other entertainment, and cut rates on drugs and discounts from some neighborhood grocery and furniture stores. Los Angeles County even has a department of senior citizens' affairs, which encourages old people "to go in (to stores) and ask for special benefits," says John Walker, assistant director of the agency.

The over-65 crowd—which soon will be getting Government-financed medical care along with its other benefits—is happy with the increasing discounts and would like to see more. "Senior citizens should have free hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses," says Julius Johnson, 72, a retired Ford Motor Co. worker in Detroit. Gordon Brocklebank, 69, a former warehouseman, says he would "like to see the 4-percent sales tax taken off food for us."

LIVING CLOSE TO THE LINE

One reason many oldsters want more benefits is that they say they can barely get along on the money they have. Says Julius Johnson's wife: "You have to live too close to the line. Groceries have gone up so high. You can't make a little money go a long way anymore." Harry Riflin, 77, a retired tailor here, agrees. "Those discounts are a good idea," he says. "Older people can't live on what they get. Take off rent and medical insurance and there's not much left."

The plans for the elderly definitely have brought in new business from their younger friends and relatives, say banks and the Revco drugstore chain, but they concede they can't accurately measure the impact. The manager of a Detroit bowling alley says a special price for older people—three lines for \$1 instead of the usual 50 cents a line—has boosted business to as many as 200 oldsters an afternoon from 20 to 25 before the plan was started.

Businessmen don't always respond, of course, to pleas by older people for special discounts. In Detroit, letters by oldsters to newspapers recently asked for special rates for haircuts, but barbers apparently are deaf to the demand. In Lansing, Mich., a plea for cutrate tax charges also has failed.

When special rates are introduced there generally is little opposition, although Revco has run into some from Michigan's Board of Pharmacy, which figures the plan "discriminates" against younger people. The board forced Revco to stop enrolling old persons in the discount plan in Michigan, although it allowed the company to continue the discounts for those already signed up.

"Old people can get free drugs through welfare and old-age assistance," says Allan Weatherwax, 59-year-old executive secretary of the pharmacy board. And he adds: "Young people may need more help than old folks." Noting that the State itself has

legislated some special discounts for older persons, Mr. Weatherwax comments: "There is a difference between what is right and what is politically motivated."

WHY FIGHT IN VIETNAM?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 8, the Washington Evening Star published an editorial, entitled "Why Fight in Vietnam?"

It is in the belief that there can never be too much clarification or reiteration of this position that I call to the attention of my colleagues this fine interpretation.

Besieged by critics from all sides who often propose simple solutions, the President has once again defined our Nation's commitment to peace in the world. A lesser man would not have the courage to steadfastly maintain this difficult and complex posture in what is a disagreeable, distasteful situation.

By his example we must all realize there are no easy, painless solutions. We must also realize the alternatives are clear cut. As the President stated in his remarks upon arriving in Honolulu:

If we allow the Communists to win in Vietnam * * * we will have to fight again someplace else.

Mr. Speaker, since this is a matter of utmost concern to us all I insert it in the RECORD where it can be given careful study by my colleagues:

WHY FIGHT IN VIETNAM?

Once again the President has tried to answer those among his critics who say they do not understand why the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

The critics will not be satisfied with the answer. For there is nothing new in it. But it is hard to know what more the President might have said in his remarks upon arriving in Honolulu.

In substance, this is what he had to say: We are fighting to determine whether aggression and terror are the way of the future—a question of the gravest importance to all other nations, large or small, who seek to walk in peace and independence. If the Communists win in Vietnam they will know they can accomplish through so-called wars of liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere.

At this point, Mr. Johnson, in perhaps the most significant phase of his remarks, decided to lock horns with his senatorial critics, especially those in his own party. "There are special pleaders," he said, "who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. We cannot accept their logic that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us—or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe. Were we to follow their course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be re-

spected, our word honored, our commitment believed. * * * If we allow the Communists to win in Vietnam * * * we will have to fight again someplace else—at what cost no one knows. That is why it is vitally important to every American family that we stop the Communists in South Vietnam."

It could not have been easy for a consensus man to say these things. He knows his explanation will neither satisfy nor silence his critics. But there it is. The President has taken his stand and it will be difficult if not impossible for him to turn back. Nor is it at all likely, the critics notwithstanding, that Mr. Johnson intends to turn back if he thinks he has the support of the American people, to whom his comments were really addressed.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence is another reminder of the tactics and policies of the Soviets against the peoples of the world who love freedom and independence.

It was in 1918 that these 40 million residents of the rich Ukraine moved toward self-government after the collapse of the Russian Empire. But the Bolsheviks with a Russian army invaded the new nation, set up their puppet government and the territory went under the control of the Communist dictators.

The familiar story of oppression and pillage followed. The resources of 250,000 square miles of fertile land, the mines and industry were diverted to the upbuilding of Communist power.

Resistance was bitter and very costly. Massacre and famine followed. Millions were uprooted, sent to Siberia, to other Asiatic areas to face a bitter existence as slave laborers.

And while we hear this talk of co-existence, let us remember the pattern of conquest, the ruin of peoples and of nations that have come under the Kremains fist.

In the United States today we have many Ukrainians who escaped the Communists. They have taken a place in their adopted country, are leaders in professions, citizens of the finest type. It is this group, with a full realization of the benefits of liberty, that are the voice of the 40 million behind the Iron Curtain that help keep us conscious of the dangers of communism in our country.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

CENTRAL FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE BLOOD DONORS SUPPORT UNITED STATES TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress an incident which recently occurred in the district which I represent.

It is a refreshing contrast to the stories we read of the draft card burnings, and so forth.

These young people are serving just as the men overseas are serving.

The following story was provided me by Mr. R. N. "Bert" Dosh, editor emeritus of the Ocala, Fla., Star-Banner:

One hundred persons donated a pint of blood each at Central Florida Junior College located at Ocala in mid-December in support of United States troops in Vietnam.

The CFJC campus was the site of the "bleed-in" sponsored by the Central Florida College Civitan Club. Community residents as well as CFJC students, faculty, and staff were invited to participate in the blood donation program, according to Lester R. Goldman, director of student activities and collegiate Civitan sponsor.

The blood was drawn by the mid-Florida Red Cross program with headquarters in Daytona Beach.

Because whole blood will keep only 21 days, the blood drawn at CFJC was sent to the Squibb laboratories in New Brunswick, N.J., to be fractionated and subsequently sent to the U.S. Department of Defense for stockpiling for use by U.S. troops as needed.

A number of organizations contributed to the "bleed-in" in various ways, including the Marion County Medical Association, Munroe Memorial Hospital, the Ocala Junior Woman's Club, the Marion County Chapter of the American Red Cross, the CFJC Department of Nursing Education, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Nehi Bottling Works, Public Market, and many individuals.

The list of those who contributed follows:

Kerr, William R., Ocala; McKenney, Carl O., Ocala; Barthlow, Arthur P., Ocala; Reames, Joe M., Gainesville; Ritterhoff, Dorothy A., Ocala; Miller, Mark S., Ocala; Beses, Thomas R., Inverness; Childress, Joe B., Citra; Greene, John M., Ocala; Maguire, Glen, Groveland; Herrin, William, Ocala; Blake, Timothy M., Ocala; Thomas, William J., Ocala; Branan, William V., Ocala; Cramer, John L., Anthony; Bryant, Robert C., Ocala; Brodbent, Albert S., Ocala; Miller, Curtis R., Gainesville; Aubrey, Ray H., Jr., Ocala; Glanzer, Charles M., Ocala; White, Benny C., Sparr; Denson, Jay T., Ocala; Brasington, John A., Ocala; Rittenhoff, Robert F., Ocala; Hart, Michael L., Oklawaha; Murphy, Arvid R., Ocala; McCown, Bruce L., Umatilla.

Richerton, Darrell, Ocala; Rou, Judy, Reddick; Michelle, Georgini, Oxford; Jaffe, Dennis J., Orlando; Dore, Edward J., Orlando; Johnston, Jane, Gainesville; Waters, Robert A., Ocala; Wood, Lana Sue, Ocala; Cowart, Gayle, Mascotte; Miller, Kenneth D., Ocala; Stockdale, Irving, Ocala; Steele, William R., Ocala; Woods, Carolyn J., Ocala; Friel, Billie, Ocala; Purvis, Sydney R., Jacksonville; Balasch, Paul J., Inverness; Kepple, Sharon K., Ocala; Fordyce, Joseph, Ocala; Colium, Donna, Ocala; Bowser, Linda, Summerfield;

Futch, John E., Ocala; Stein, Roger A., Jacksonville; DeVore, Henry F., Reddick; Conrad, Craig H., Ocala; Mazourek, Alvin, Brooksville; Simonds, Edward P., Jr.; Perry, Eva S. Oklawaha.

Carter, Thomas P., Chiefland; Alif, James H., Ocala; Branswig, Norman L., Ocala; Johnson, John J., Inverness; Fennell, George A., Ocala; Ritch, John C., Gainesville; Lynn, Wade, Ocala; Baker, Pat, Hawthorne; Curtis, Wayne, Ocala; Drummond, Arch John, Gainesville; Porter, Kenneth, Gainesville; Pfeifer, Michael, Newberry; Beasley, Elsa, Trenton; Sniper, Thomas G., Ocala; Gattrell, Donna, Reddick; Bass, Robert, Ocala; Hancock, Anthony R., Ocala; Barber, W. B., Ocala; Russell, Dale, Ocala; Barnett, J. R. III, Fort Meade; Schnessler, Diana, Ocala; Garrar, David, Greenfield, Ind.; Nell, Ronald, Ocala.

Amerl, Booshang, Ocala; Gray, Jeanette L., Ocala; Peebles, Jack G., Dunnellon; Treacy, Stephen, Lecanto; Turek, Richard W., Belleview; Prime, Kermit, Cross City; Bridges, Robert T., Ocala; Corliss, Lawrence, Ocala; Robbins, George W., Ocala; Herndon, Bettie M., Oklawaha; Stephens, Stanley E., Dunnellon; Packard, Phillip Bruce, Gainesville; Russ, Robert, Wildwood; Beshiri, Gerald A., Ocala; Brennan, John Jr., Brooklynn, N.Y.; Witter, Pam, Ocala; Ohlinger, Fred, Ocala; McClellan, Byron D., Ocala; Stone, Dottie, Ocala; Stephens, Charles, Ocala; Birch, Richard, Ocala; Crenshaw, Mary A., Summerfield.

INTRODUCTION OF WILD RIVERS BILL

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the preservation of rivers in their natural state, along with the adjacent land areas, is an undertaking of utmost importance not only to today's generation but for the enjoyment of the Americans who will be here after we are gone.

I am introducing a wild rivers bill today identical to the first bill to pass the Senate in this session of the Congress.

This bill establishes two basic wild river categories for the immediate future. In the first category, 7 rivers are designated immediately as wild rivers, and in the second category, 17 rivers are specified as meriting study as to whether they should be brought into the Wild Rivers System.

In both categories, rivers are included which are of importance to the people of Maryland and Metropolitan Washington. Included for immediate designation as wild rivers are the Cacapon and Shenandoah in West Virginia. Designated for consideration for future incorporation are rivers in Pennsylvania, along with Maryland's Youghiogheny River in Garrett County.

These rivers, as part of our original landscape, comprise part of our American heritage which we should protect for posterity, and I hope the Wild Rivers System will be established by the 89th Congress.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wild Rivers Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2 (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wild Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "wild river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. Areas designated as "wild river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA

(b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related adjacent land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as depicted on maps numbered "NWR-SAL-1001, NWR-CLE-1001, NWR-ROG-1001, NWR-RIO-1000, NWR-ELE-1000, NWR-CAP-1000, and NWR-SHE-1000" are hereby designated as "wild river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—the Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake River and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—the Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to its origin.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—the segment extending from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—the segment extending from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower four miles of the Red River.

(5) Eleven Point, Missouri—the segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

(6) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.

(7) Shenandoah, West Virginia—the segment of the river located in the State of West Virginia.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

FEDERAL-STATE PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation

with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Wild Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—the entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) Green, Wyoming—the segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderess Area, south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(3) Hudson, New York—the segment of the mainstem extending from its origin in the Adirondack Park downstream to the vicinity of the town of Luzerne; Boreas River from its mouth to Durgin Brook; Indian River from its mouth to Abanakee Dam; and Cedar River from its mouth to Cedar River flow.

(4) Missouri, Montana—the segment upstream from Fort Peck Reservoir toward the town of Fort Benton.

(5) Niobrara, Nebraska—the mainstem segment lying between the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(6) Skagit, Washington—the Skagit from the town of Mount Vernon upstream to Gorge powerhouse near the town of Newhalem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the confluence of the North and South Forks; the Sauk from its mouth to Elliott Creek; and the Suiattle from its mouth to Milk Creek.

(7) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—the segment of the Susquehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(8) Wolf, Wisconsin—the segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

(9) Suwannee, Georgia and Florida—entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf, and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

(10) Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania—from Oakland, Maryland, to the Youghiogheny Reservoir, and from the Youghiogheny Dam, downstream to the town of Conneltsville, Pennsylvania.

(11) Little Miami, Ohio—the segment of the Little Miami River in Clark, Greene, Warren, and Clermont Counties from a point in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of Morrow, Ohio.

(12) Little Beaver, Ohio—the segment of the North and Middle Forks of the Little Beaver River, in Columbiana County, from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio.

(13) Pine Creek, Pennsylvania—the segment from Ansonia, Pennsylvania, to Waterville, Pennsylvania.

(14) Delaware, Pennsylvania and New York—the segment from Hancock, New York, to Matamoras, Pennsylvania.

(15) Allegheny, Pennsylvania—the segment from the Allegheny Reservoir at Kinzua, Pennsylvania, to Tionesta, Pennsylvania, and then from Franklin, Pennsylvania, to East Brady, Pennsylvania.

(16) Clarion, Pennsylvania—the segment from where it enters the Allegheny River to Ridgway, Pennsylvania.

(17) West Branch Susquehanna, Pennsylvania—the segment of the West Branch Susquehanna from Clearfield, Pennsylvania, to Lock Haven, Pennsylvania.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(c) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential wild river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigations to determine which additional wild river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports by all Federal agencies as potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved.

OTHER ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall also submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Wild Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(e) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated wild river area would be located. Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the agencies and States consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been notified of the proposed recommendation, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal or Federal and State programs in the basin, and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

(f) Whenever it is proposed to add a river or segment thereof to the National Wild Rivers System, and the river or segment runs through non-Federal land, recommendations with respect to its addition and with respect to whether it should be wholly or partly acquired, protected, and managed pursuant to exclusive State authority shall be made to the President by the Governor of each State concerned. Such recommendation to the President shall be accompanied by or based upon a general State plan which assures the effectuation of the purposes of this Act in perpetuity. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the designation of such river or segment thereof as a part of the National Wild Rivers System and the administration of such area by State authority, together with such draft legislation that he deems appropriate.

NEED FOR LAND ACQUISITION

(g) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Wild Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the wild river area designated by subsection 3(a), paragraph (4) and the Secretary of Agriculture shall ad-

minister the areas designated by paragraphs (2) and (5). The area designated by paragraphs (1), (3), (6), and (7) shall be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President.

(b) Wild river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that when the wild river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the wild river area shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President. The Secretary charged with the administration of a wild river area or portion thereof designated by this Act or by subsequent Acts may agree with the Governor of the State for State or local governmental agency participation in the administration of the area. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and administration of such wild river areas where they include State-owned or county-owned lands. Any Federal land located within a wild river area may, with the consent of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary or State for administration as part of the wild river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a wild river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of a wild river area as defined by section 3 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That neither Secretary may acquire lands, waters, or interests therein by condemnation without the owner's consent when 50 per centum or more of the acreage or stream bank within the entire wild river area is owned by Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, but this limitation shall not apply to the acquisition of scenic easements. Lands owned by an Indian tribe may be acquired only with the consent of the tribal governing body. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property within a wild river area, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State in which the river or segment thereof runs, except lands within the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System, or revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal fair market value. If they are not of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary of the Interior may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchanges of national forest lands. Any such lands acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture within or adjacent to a national forest shall upon acquisition become national forest lands. Money appropriated for Federal or State purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this Act. As used in this Act the term "scenic easement" means the right to control the use of land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of

protecting the scenic view from the river for the purposes of this Act, but such control shall not affect any regular use exercised prior to the acquisition of the easement.

(d) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands by condemnation, for the purpose of including such lands in any wild river area, if such lands are located within any incorporated city, village, or borough within such area, when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within any wild river area without the consent of said county as long as the county is following a plan for the management, zoning and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) Wherever the power of condemnation has been conferred by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire in fee title by condemnation an area which may not extend more than three hundred feet on either side of the stream, tributary, or river; and either Secretary may acquire by condemnation for scenic easements, or other interests in land other than fee title, an area which extends no more than one thousand three hundred and twenty feet from either side of the stream, tributary, or river.

(g) A wild river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment, but without limitation on other uses, including timber harvesting and livestock grazing, that do not substantially interfere with these purposes. The Secretary of the Interior, in administering such areas, may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for recreation and preservation purposes, and the conservation and management of natural resources, as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture, in administering such areas, shall utilize the statutory authorities relating to the national forests in such manner as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(h) No lands, waters or interests therein other than scenic easements may be administered under this Act as a part of the National Wild Rivers System if such lands, waters, or interests were acquired by a State under its power of condemnation for the specific purpose of making such lands, waters, or interests therein a part of the National Wild Rivers System under this Act.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance of any dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within the National Wild Rivers System, except that all mining claims located after the effective date of this Act shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of national forest lands, may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Any patent issued shall recite this limitation. All such regulations shall provide among other things for safeguard against pollution of the river.

(c) Any portion of a wild river area that is within the National Wilderness Preservation System, as established by the Act of September 3, 1964 (Public Law 88-577), shall

be subject to the provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act with respect to the preservation of such a wild river area, and in case of conflict between the provisions of these Acts the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

(d) The head of any Federal or State agency administering a wild river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, for the purpose of eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within a wild river area.

(e) The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law. Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(f) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

(g) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Wild Rivers System.

(h) A State shall have such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access by such State to the beds of navigable streams, tributaries, or rivers (or segments thereof) which are vested in the State, in case such beds are located in a wild river area.

(i) Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

(j) The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the purposes of this Act or its administration.

Sec. 6. In recognition of the fact that changes may occur in the circumstances of wild river areas included in the National Wild Rivers System or in the needs for the resources associated with such areas, which will require future Congresses to make changes in the system, and in order to assure that the Congress is kept informed of such changes in circumstances or needs, there is created a National Wild Rivers Review Board, to make reviews and furnish reports to the Congress as hereinafter provided.

The National Wild Rivers Review Board shall consist of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of the several States for the purpose of consideration of the status of any river included within the National Wild Rivers System which lies within their States.

Within sixty days after the convening of a new Congress, commencing with the second Congress after the enactment of this Act, the National Wild Rivers Review Board shall file a report and recommendations with the President of the Senate and with the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall contain a discussion of any significant developments since the date of enactment of the Act, or since the last report, including but not limited to the following subjects: Technology of passage

of fish over dams; status and trends of anadromous fish runs; activities by way of construction or otherwise pursuant to international agreements relating to any basin in which wild rivers are designated; projected national, regional, or local demand for additional electrical generating capacity, particularly as related to existence or possibility of declarations of national emergency; and Federal or State legislative changes which affect the financing of river or reclamation development projects, including basin account authorizations relative to any basin in which wild rivers are designated. The National Wild Rivers Review Board is authorized and directed to conduct continuing comparative studies which would measure the balance of benefits and detriments of each wild river to the State in which it is located, and to report to Congress, as appropriate, recommendations to assure that, wherever it is found that the reclamation of arid land would better serve the public interest of such State, the same shall not be prejudiced by the wild rivers status of any stream.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE THAT CERTAIN FORMS OF COPPER BE ADMITTED FREE OF DUTY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] and my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] in introducing legislation to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty. This measure has the support of the administration.

Copper is an essential material for many American industries—ranging from the electrical industry, wiring, the production of many consumer goods and many small fabricators of specialized equipment. It is of particular interest to Connecticut and the shortage of this commodity has presented serious problems to many business concerns.

According to Secretary Fowler, there is a critical shortage of copper in the United States and in the international market. The effect of this bill would be to suspend until June 30, 1968, import duties on copper which generally amount to 1.7 cents per pound. U.S. purchasers of copper on the world market have been hampered by the duty-free status of that commodity in other countries, enabling our competitors to outbid the United States in the market. This suspension of duty on copper should help our copper users to compete more effectively for the available copper supply.

Foreign copper is vital to this country. We cannot produce domestically enough copper to satisfy the needs of U.S. consumers and the above-mentioned tariff

problem has placed our copper users in a virtually untenable situation. The United States is dependent upon imports for roughly 30 percent of our consumption of new refined copper on an annual basis.

This bill has the support of the producers and the consumers of copper, and again, of the administration. I urge that this House act speedily on this proposal.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AIDS NEW LIBRARY IN BROOKLYN CENTER

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I participated in the dedication ceremony for the new library in the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn. This library is the first in the United States to receive financial aid under the Library Services and Construction Act.

The citizens of Brooklyn Center have made the major financial contribution to their new library. They voted for a bond issue which supplied \$190,000 of the funds needed to build the library. They should be highly commended for their wisdom and community spirit.

But the \$60,000 which the Federal Government supplied was a substantial contribution to this new library. This contribution was made possible only because Congress in 1964 passed the Library Services and Construction Act. This act not only greatly increased the Federal assistance to public libraries, but also made this assistance available to communities of over 10,000 population.

The library in Brooklyn Center is only the first in what I hope will be a large number of new library facilities which are built with the help of the Federal Government. The Library Services and Construction Act is due to expire in June of this year. I hope that the Members of this body will support legislation which will extend and expand the library assistance program.

MEN OF COURAGE IN AN EMERGENCY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in times of emergency and danger, three human qualities count more than all others. They are: courage, coolness, and ingenuity. The ordinary individual may show one of these qualities, but only the true genius can be expected to exhibit all of them in a crisis.

The recent blizzards along the Atlantic seaboard probably called for a number of instances of real manhood. However, unfortunately few of them come to our attention, and we are not able to pay them the tribute of admiration their behavior evokes.

One such instance occurred recently in my Congressional District of West Virginia. It is recorded in vivid terms of my long-time friend, Walter L. "Bill" Hart, editor of the Dominion News, Morgantown, W. Va. It deals with men who work familiarly with danger, and for them only the most unusual can attract attention. In recognition of the superior quality of all those men who serve the cause of civilization under similar conditions, it is my desire to call to the attention of each Member the following editorial:

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Jan. 11, 1966]

IT MAY INTEREST YOU

(By Bill Hart and staff)

Once in a while, especially in the lives of newspaper people, it seems, you seem to walk alongside God as the issue of life or death is being decided for some friend. Such was the scene the other twilight as z-1, as is his custom, walked into the flight service station of the Federal Aviation Agency at the Morgantown airport. Two old pros in the business of safety in the air, Domenick Bellotte and Charlie Derry, were at the consoles, and, perhaps born of experience, z-1 immediately sensed an emergency. There was not one, there were several. George Fallon was somewhere in the mountains south and east, they thought, an Air Force ambulance plane was seeking sanctuary with a bleeding ulcer patient that had to have immediate hospitalization.

Two Pittsburgh to Miami airliners were asking for position fixes before they could be cleared across the desolate mountain ranges separating the steel center of the world and the playground of the rich and not so rich 900 air miles away, and they had to get those "fixes" from Morgantown before Cleveland center could clear flight planes. Another aircraft was asking for landing instructions, still another was on the ground awaiting takeoff orders; Lake Central had two Norde inbound moments away from the outer marker, and every telephone in the place was ringing not to mention the clang of attention bells on the teletypes that connect Morgantown with more than 500 stations throughout the Nation.

Somehow or other you find yourself in the middle of something like that, and quicker than two steps to the living room we found ourselves on the telephones with the State police on one, the sheriff of Tucker County on another, and the Elkins police asking things on a third. This is the spat we should have had Ruby Thomas, the boss of a switchboard where emergencies are ordinary and miracles are handled almost every day, but the calming thing for all was the Marine-trained voice of George Fallon, and he was the guy who was really in trouble. His radio was not working well, he was over a rugged mountain, the weather couldn't have been worse; it was snowing, it was icing.

Domenick said: "George, how much fuel you got left?" "Two hours and a half" come back the matter-of-fact voice. "Oh, no sweat," said Domenick which was something less than the truth as Charlie Derry was trying to get the rest of the aircraft in order—especially the Air Force ambulance plane with the bleeding ulcer case and a call went out for an ambulance. But there was something more than "a sweat" over

Fallon, the next act he performed probably did more to save George's life than all the other work on the part of a lot of folks—he gave up his "coordinates" right on the button—a feat that doesn't happen to a pilot in trouble once in a hundred times.

"Stay where you are, stay with those lights of that town you see," either Domenick or Charlie kept telling George and George kept saying "affirmative." By this time Elkins reported no aircraft overhead; so did Davis and Thomas, but the call to Parsons brought results. The State police were told "get in the center of town, turn on your red flashing light" and then George was asked if he could see the light? "Affirmative." So the fix was positive and into the air then went the old pro of all pilots here—Sam (the Lindbergh of the Alleghenies) Frankman with young Herb Baker as his copilot. Said Domenick to George: "Stay there, Sam is coming after you." "Affirmative" came the answer, but in the tone you could tell George was happy "Old Sam" was coming.

Cleveland Center took Sam on the radar-scope to over Parsons in 12 minutes, but the overcast wouldn't let him get lower than 6,000 feet—not enough. Meantime, at the suggestion of the Morgantown flight service, the people of Parsons cleared their main street for an emergency landing and put cars with lights facing into wind on an old emergency field. George was told to take his choice. He chose the field. For 10 minutes then there was absolute silence—George was either down back of a mountain sore or else—the radio couldn't reach him as Sam turned to sneak under the overcast through a valley he knew about in the Elkins area. Then came the voice of a State trooper: "The pilot's down, he's OK and so is his plane; not a scratch," and that, friends, is what happened the other twilight at the FAA center at Morgantown, and those who worked in the FAA, at Parsons, at Elkins, Thomas, Davis, Cleveland, and the men in "Twin-Bonanza 449" may have been permitted for those fleeting moments to have walked beside God and saw Him perform another miracle—for George—calm as he was—landing at night in a field in a storm—that, friends, those of us who live a lot in the skies, think is a miracle only God can fashion. What do you think?

SUSPEND COPPER DUTY

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the worldwide shortage of copper and the resulting price rise have already created critical problems in this country. Our greatly expanded defense efforts in Vietnam will require assurance that our producers will receive their maximum share of this strategically essential material.

Since many of the U.S. major copper-consuming industries are located in Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley, which is located in my congressional district, I have followed the copper shortage very closely since 1964 when a serious supply-demand situation first became apparent.

After successfully recommending the release of 20,000 tons of copper from the national stockpile, I introduced legislation which resulted in the release of an

additional 150,000 tons in early 1965. Also in 1965, when Secretary of Defense McNamara acknowledged the persistence of the copper shortage and announced plans to distribute another 200,000 tons of stockpile copper, I maintained close liaison with the distributing agencies to insure that the firms in my district received the maximum amount possible under the terms of this release. Having been so closely connected with the copper shortage, I am well aware that these corrective measures have been helpful but not completely effective.

Therefore, in another effort to increase the availability of copper, I introduced yesterday H.R. 12676, a bill to suspend temporarily the 1.7-cents-per-pound duty on various forms of copper and copper scrap.

This bill is essential because the United States is a net importer of copper, depending upon imports in 1965 for about 8 percent of new supply. Also important is the increasingly tight world market.

U.S. purchasers have often failed in bidding with foreign competitors for the scarce supply of copper largely because of the duty-free treatment our competitors accord to such imports in their countries. The suspension of this duty will strengthen the competitive position of U.S. purchasers, and it will increase the availability of copper ores and concentrates to our domestic industry, and, at the same time, contribute to our efforts to hold the domestic price line.

I am confident that the House will agree with the objectives of this bill, and I recommend its early passage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HALL, for February 15 through 17, 1966, on account of business in district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 30 minutes, on February 15; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO), for 30 minutes, on February 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BRADEMAS.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UTT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. MACKIE in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2020. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security," for fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2021. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 21st semiannual report of the activities of the Commission as of December 31, 1964, pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and section 3(c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2022. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2023. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2024. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 709. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expense of studies and investigations au-

thorized by House Resolution 89; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 716. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 717. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 697. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 85; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 696. Resolution to provide for additional expenses for the investigations and studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service authorized by House Resolution 245, 89th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 711. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 141; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 713. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 112; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 718. Resolution providing additional funds for further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 68, 89th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 640. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ eight additional employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1666. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12707. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 12708. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 12709. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership

to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12710. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12711. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12712. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12713. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the amount which may be paid on account of the funeral expenses of certain veterans from \$250 to \$500; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 12714. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12715. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 12716. A bill to correct certain inequities and relieve certain liabilities arising out of overpayments of compensation to Government employees as a result of administrative error in the application of certain provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, and other provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 12717. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12718. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 12719. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12720. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 12721. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12722. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 26, 1934, to authorize the overprinting of certain of such stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 12723. A bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to provide medical treatment and services, and drugs and medicines to those veterans receiving additional pension under old law pension provi-

sions based on need for regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12724. A bill to amend 38 U.S.C. 312 to increase the presumption of service connection for chronic functional psychoses to 3 years from separation from a period of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 12725. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12728. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12729. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12730. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for law enforcement purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12731. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 12732. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 12733. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 12734. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase by \$750 million the authorization of appropriation for the fiscal year of 1967, and to authorize payment to be made to States for retirement of certain bonds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12735. A bill to release the community of Angoon, Alaska, from certain indebtedness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 12736. A bill to amend 10 U.S.C. 1212 (c) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deduct disability compensation payments at less than the full monthly rate from the severance pay received for the same disability in cases of economic hardship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 12737. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 12738. A bill to aid the Congress in requiring attendance and testimony of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 12739. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 12740. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 12741. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the purchase by the United States of arms or ammunition from foreign firms which have used slave labor, unless compensation has been made to the individuals involved or their heirs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 12742. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12743. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding \$100 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12744. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the purchase by the United States of arms or ammunition from foreign firms which have used slave labor, unless compensation has been made to the individuals involved or their heirs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 830. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 831. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 25th anniversary on February 19, 1966, of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. Con. Res. 582. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim May 14, 1966, as National Avocado Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim May 14, 1966, as National Avocado Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 726. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12745. A bill for the relief of Mr. Bernard Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12746. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Ingu Dallara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12747. A bill for the relief of Ivy Noreen Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 12748. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sara Lopez-Galvez and her three children, Joel, Guillermina, and Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 12749. A bill for the relief of Eva Szeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 12750. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Marieh Guirguls, Mr. Alf Ebeldalla Guirguls, and Miss Mona Guirguls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12751. A bill for the relief of Cavit Aldeide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CIA Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I extended my remarks in the RECORD and inserted several ar-

ticles dealing with the CIA. In that statement I indicated that I strongly supported this organization and felt that they were doing a fine job.

Last Sunday on CBS, Senator SALTONSTALL, a respected Member of the Senate and a member of the Armed Services Committee and as such a member of the subcommittee dealing with CIA activities appeared on the program "Face the Nation." I was pleased with the Senator's remarks dealing with the CIA and was doubly pleased that he too rose to

the defense of this organization. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that portion of Senator SALTONSTALL's remarks concerning the CIA:

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, you are a member of the subcommittee of Senator McCARTHY of Minnesota, and he seeks to investigate the influence of the CIA on foreign policy. He feels that it is perhaps too much, and that it is harmful. How do you feel about that?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am very much against such an investigation, Martin, for this reason. We are the largest and most